DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 121 891 UD 015 944

AUTHOR Miller, Edith
TITLE Curriculum, Attitudes, and Resources for Ethnic Studies (CARES). ESEA Title III. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Montgomery County Public Schools, Ala.
PUB DATE [illegible] Aug 75
NOTE 126p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Affective Objectives; *Changing Attitudes; Cognitive Objectives; *Curriculum Design; Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Groups; *Ethnic Studies; Evaluation Methods; Federal Programs; Minority Groups; *Program Evaluation; Reports; Success Factors; *Summative Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Alabama (Montgomery); CARES; Curriculum Attitudes Resources Ethnic Studies; *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA Title III

ABSTRACT

The goal of Curriculum, Attitudes, and Resources for Ethnic Studies (CARES) is to promote ethnic literacy through affective and cognitive avenues. The objectives are to develop positive attitudes, to enhance the self-esteem of students and teachers, and to use these in the implementation of an ethnic oriented curriculum. The major activities of CARES are to provide: (1) a large scale human development experience for teachers, o parents, students, and other staff; (2) an intensive workshop where affective and ethnic concerns are translated into curriculum materials (such as elementary social studies, language arts, mathematics, and arts education); and (3) two additional Saturday workshop sessions. The experiences receive positive responses, and both objective evaluations and open ended responses are very positive. The second part of the document presents evaluation data by objective. Four of the eight process objectives are fully met, and six of the ten product objectives are fully met. The four process objectives that are not met relate to changes in the population to be served rather than in failure to provide the process. Attendance and participation are good. The four product objectives which are not met are not clear evidence of failure, and explanations accounting for the results are provided for each objective not met. The project is a success and a new project-ACHIEVE-which juxtaposes a cognitive dimension to the affective while adding a research component is a logical next step. (Author/AM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED121891

ESEA TITLE III

Curriculum, Attitudes, and Resources for Ethnic Studies (CARES)

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Submitted to: Dr. W. S. Garrett, Superintendent

Montgomery Public Schools

Montgomery, Alabama 36103

Prepared by

Edith Miller, Ed.D.

Evaluator

Auburn University

August 30, 1975

UD015944

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

TABLE OF CONTENTS i

LIST OF TABLES iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF APPENDIXES v

PART I

Introduction 2

Evaluator's Comments 9

PART II

Presentation of Data by Objective

Process Objective 1.1 12

Product Objective 1.2 16

Product Objective 1.3 17

Process Objective 2.1 19

Process Objective 2.2 20

Process Objective 2.3 21

Process Objective 2.4 22

Process Objective 2.5 23

Product Objective 2.6 31

Product Objective 2.7 35

Process Objective 3.1 36

Product Objective 3.2 37

Product Objective 3.3 39

Product Objective 3.4 41

PAGE

Process Objective 4.1 45

Product Objective 4.2 46

Product Objective 4.3 48

Product Objective 4.4 49

APPENDIX 51

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	PHASE I PARTICIPANTS	12
II	EVALUATION OF PHASE I	15
III	TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE	16
IV	SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEASURE OF ATTITUDES PRE AND POST PHASE I	17
V	PHASE II PARTICIPANTS (SOCIAL STUDIES)	19
VI	PHASE II PARTICIPANTS (LANGUAGE ARTS)	20
VII	PHASE II PARTICIPANTS (MUSIC-ART)	21
VIII	PHASE II PARTICIPANTS (SCIENCE)	22
IX	PHASE II PARTICIPANTS (MATHEMATICS)	23
X	INVOLVEMENT--PERSONAL AND OTHER	25
XI	PARTICIPATION	26
XII	COMMUNICATION	27
XIII	ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE	28
XIV	GROWTH AND COMMITMENT	29
XV	RATINGS OF CARES MODELS	34
XVI	MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY (MTAI)	35

TABLE		PAGE
XVII	ATTENDANCE AT THEMATIC SESSIONS	36
XVIII	SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEASURE OF ATTITUDES POST-PROJECT	39
XIX	SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL--CHANGES IN ATTITUDE	46
XX	SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ATTITUDE MEASURE--t-values	47
XXI	SELF CONCEPT DIFFERENCE SCORES	48
XXII	t-values FOR SELF CONCEPT DATA	48
XXIII	STUDENT CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST DATA FOR TENTH GRADE	49
XXIV	STUDENT CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST DATA FOR FOURTH GRADE	50

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF APPENDIXES

APPENDIX		PAGE
A	INSTRUMENTS	52
B	TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT DATA (CARES PARTICIPANTS)	63
C	SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ATTITUDE MEASURE FOR PHASE I AND PHASE II PARTICIPANTS	63
D	EVALUATION OF PHASE II	84
E	RELIABILITY ANALYSES OF RATINGS OF CARES MODELS	94
F	MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY (MTAI) DATA	96
G	SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION DATA	97
H	STUDENT SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ATTITUDE MEASURE DATA	99
I	STUDENT SELF CONCEPT DATA	108
J	STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT TEST DATA	111

PART I

INTRODUCTION

AND

EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS

Introduction

> The goal of CARES is to promote ethnic literacy through affective and cognitive avenues. The objectives are to develop positive attitudes, to enhance the self-esteem of students and teachers, and to utilize these feelings for a commitment level of operation and implementation of an innovative ethnic-oriented curriculum which will grow out of affective concern.

The above quotation is the brief summary which appears on the ESEA Title III Statistical Report. This brief statement is accurate; however, it simply does not communicate the full impact of the CARES concept. Part of the inadequacy of the statement is the fault of its brevity; part of its inaccuracy is the general inability to communicate in writing about strongly affective concerns. This evaluation report suffers some similar problems. While neither the evaluative data nor the reporting of these data is brief, it is difficult--sometimes impossible--to measure and document the effect of an experience like CARES. Furthermore, the effects of an experience like CARES is sometimes long-term, and there is no provision to determine whether or not they show up after some time. Even with these limitations, the evaluation indicates that the CARES project was successful.

The major activities of CARES were (1) a large scale human development experience for teachers, supervisors,

support personnel, parents, and students, (2) an intensive workshop where the affective and ethnic concerns of the first experience were translated into curriculum materials to be used in classrooms, and (3) two additional Saturday workshop sessions on CARES concepts during the year. These experiences received very positive responses. The objective evaluations were high; the open-ended responses were very positive. Fewer than a dozen negative comments were made out of more than 250 comments. Some illustrative comments are:

> I have been a teacher in Montgomery for 3 years and have attended several workshops. This has been the most helpful. The instructors were great. I have learned much that will help me to become a better teacher and make my classroom a better place to learn. I feel that I gained knowledge from teachers, students, and support personnel that will help Montgomery County CARE about education. Thanks for caring.

> I think that this workshop was great! When a group of people who are completely different come together and work positively, accomplishments and potentialities are limitless. I feel that we have learned how important communication is as well as how to communicate effectively.

> I found this workshop enjoyable, provocative, interesting, and meaningful. The sessions were a kind of therapy in themselves. They were well organized and skillfully handled.
> Every activity tended to opitimize the real essence of the acronym, "CARE."

> I saw no point in all the parlor games to begin with, but now I see your point. How I

> wish life were not so rigid! Will it ever come about? It's always do this, do that, or the teachers won't approve of you. Thank you for helping us have a better insight into ourselves and others.
>
> I feel that this workshop has really made me aware of some things I never thought about before. In all the games and different activities there has been some meaning, and I enjoyed learning so much. I'd like to do it again. Thank you.

These comments are examples of the response to all the CARES activities.

The curriculum materials which were developed during Phase II deserve some special mention. One complete set of the materials from all the subject areas is more than 2,000 pages in length. Creative and exciting ideas are available on almost every page. There is no way to summarize adequately the mass of excellent work. However, the following brief statement gives an overview of the general purpose and content of the volumes:

Elementary Social Studies. The developers of the elementary social studies CARES models introduced their material with the following statements:

> An ethnic-oriented social studies curriculum addresses itself to the teaching-learning process with as much emphasis as it addresses itself to the subject-matter which is taught...CARES participants...endeavored to make inherent in the teaching models in this notebook the following identifiable characteristics:

1. The educational potential that exists in the cultural diversity of American society--past and present.
2. Learning principles based on the idea that discovery and exploration precede the facts in meaningful learning experiences.
3. The belief that the humanistic classroom environment enhances the educational and personal development of all students.
4. The creation and utilization of cultural context and culturally-bound learning experiences.

The book contains eight teaching models ranging from a physical classroom environment model to a model for teaching elementary social studies through biographies.

Secondary Social Studies. The secondary group operated out of the same framework as the elementary group. They included the following models: (1) physical classroom environment, (2) research materials, (3) current events, (4) self-awareness, (5) group investigations in American History and Sectionalism, (6) inquiry approach to leadership, (7) concept attainment, and (8) an episode about World War I.

Elementary Language Arts. The elementary language arts materials begin with the following statement:

> We strongly believe that each child should have a good feeling about himself and his own heritage. Therefore, we have prepared activities designed to involve all children in varied meaningful language arts activities. From these experiences each child will find happiness through feelings of acceptance and identification...resulting in a positive perception of self and others.

The materials contained in the elementary manual are, for the most part, original. The sections are labelled (1) great beginnings, (2) poetry from the heart, (3) identity, (4) pride, (5) inheritance, (6) understanding, love and friendship, and (7) walled-in.

Secondary Language Arts. Three sections are included in each grade level of secondary language arts: CARES Classrooms (learning laboratories), Humanizing Activities, and Instructional Units. The general objectives for each packet are:

1. To help teachers and students create a stimulating setting for learning.
2. To help teachers become learning-facilitators.
3. To help teachers and students design cooperatively ethnic-oriented units of work consonant with student needs and interests.
4. To help teachers devise methods or strategies for implementing learning-facilitor concept thereby initiating a more student-centered, student-involved program.
5. To help students attain identity as individuals.
6. To help students interact positively with fellow individuals and learning facilitator.
7. To help students and teachers assume responsibilities consonant with their individual identities.
8. To help students and teachers identify individual learning needs.
9. To help students and teachers attain a significant degree of success in satisfying learning needs.

10. To make teaching and learning a cooperative, exciting, and profitable experience.

Science. The science curriculum materials began with the following statement:

> Based on the belief that self-perception is a determinant of one's success in the social, academic and/or economic world, the objectives of CARES are to develop positive attitudes, to enhance the self-esteem of students and teachers, and to utilize these feelings into a continuous humanistic ethnic-oriented curriculum.

The materials were organized in four sections: (1) guides for comfortable classrooms, (2) spotlighting personalities in science, (3) innovative ideas and interdisciplinary possibilities, and (4) science-oriented careers.

Elementary Mathematics. The work in elementary mathematics focused on helping teachers develop new series and use existing materials more effectively. The book consists of guidelines and suggested activities for working with the total group, small groups, and individualized instruction, manipulatives, and enrichment and reinforcement.

The statement of purpose in the manual best expresses the intent:

> Believing strongly that children learn at different rates, are different in abilities, interests and attitudes, the participants of the elementary math group of the CARES Workshop have endeavored to develop a product that will be of value to teachers and students. Consequently, the product encompasses suggested methods of meeting needs of children. It is hoped that teachers will express their own

creativity and experiment with this model so that it will become a "workable" instrument for helping them help children.

Junior High Mathematics. The junior high materials focused on designing more humane experiences in mathematics. Activities for the teacher, the environment, teacher appraisal and evaluation, and resources were suggested.

Senior High Mathematics. The senior high group attempted to design activity-oriented units:

1. To give the students an opportunity to become involved in a problem for everyday living.
2. To individualize instruction.
3. To allow each student to succeed in some area of math.
4. To provide a way for community resource people to become more directly involved in the classroom.
5. To provide a more humanistic relation between teaching and learning.
6. To enable the students to become actively involved in planning units of instruction.
7. To help the students have fun with mathematics.

Arts Education. The arts manual set the tone for its work with the following statement:

> Creativity cannot be taught; teachers can only set conditions for it to happen. Creativity can be developed by reinforcement when it does appear, but the main function of the creative teacher is to maintain certain physical, psychological, socio-emotional, and intellectual conditions within the class.

The materials focused on creativity both as a process and a product and presented the following model:

1. Explore music and materials of the arts.
2. Discover the nature of the arts.
3. Create many kinds of art.
4. Conceptualize the learnings about the arts.
5. Apply to new arts experiences.

The evaluative data are presented in Part II by objective. The raw data for these objectives are presented in the Appendix.

Evaluator's Comments

A close, hard look at the data presented in this report would lead to the conclusion that the project was a success. Four of the eight process objectives were fully met; six of the ten product objectives were fully met. The four process objectives that were not met related to changes in the population to be served rather than in failure to provide the process. Attendance and participation were good.

The four product objectives which were not met are not clear evidence of failure. Objective 3.2 which required each person using a CARES model to complete the appropriate evaluation form to document its having been used did not

include a satisfactory procedure; the directions were not clear, and too much time was required. Therefore, there is not adequate data to support the non-meeting or meeting of this objective. Objective 3.3 had an implied criterion of 100 per cent improved attitudes. The criterion at the end of Phase I was 50 per cent. The level of improved attitude post-project was 88 per cent. The objective demanded an unrealistic criterion. Objectives 4.2 and 4.3 required improved self-concepts and improved attitudes on the part of students. This experience was my first in collecting data from students at the end of school. I do not believe they are valid measures. Attitudes are poorer; self-concepts are strained. An early spring measure would have been more appropriate.

Therefore, it is the evaluator's personal conclusion that the project was indeed successful. The new project--ACHIEVE--which juxtaposes a cognitive dimension to the affective and adds a research component is a logical next step.

A personal note: There was much personal growth and positive attitude change I observed that is not herein reflected. I have never worked with a more enthusiastic or committed group of people.

PART II

PRESENTATION OF DATA

BY OBJECTIVES

Process Objective 1.1 In June, 1974, 75% of the 347 designated school personnel, students, supervisors, and community representatives from 3 elementary schools, 2 junior high schools, and 1 senior high school will participate in a ten-hour human development workshop as evidenced by attendance and class records.

TABLE I

PHASE I PARTICIPANTS

	Number	Percentage
Parents	30	12
Support Personnel	13	5
Students	27	11
Teachers	153	62
Supervisors and Principals	13	5
Parochial School Teachers	13	5
TOTAL	249	100

This table presenting the number of participants in Phase I clearly indicates that the objective of 75 percent of 347 (260) was not fully met. Actually only 234 of the participants in Phase I were from the designated public school population. This number, 234, accounts 67 percent of the projected attendance figure. While on paper, this is an obvious failure to meet the first objective, there were some extenuating circumstances. (1) At the time all

three of the schools involved were involved in massive reorganizations brought about by court order. Therefore, it was difficult to choose a stable list of people to be invited. Consequently, the figure of 347 was slightly inflated. (2) Only those participants who completed the full ten and one half hours of training were considered participants. This practice, while clearly more accurate, requires not considering other participants who partially participated.

Table II presents a summary of the responses to an instrument designed for the participants' evaluation of the Phase I experience. Using a scale from strongly agree with a value of 1 to strongly disagree with a value of 4, means were calculated for each of the forced-choice items. The lowest mean rating for any item was the value of 4.035 calculated for item 7 which related to enough time for the various activities. Approximately 18 percent of the participants did not feel that there was enough time for the various activities.

While the means of 4.1+ are indications that the participants fully agreed with the statements in the instrument, there are some contrasts which are interesting to examine. Item 5 which dealt with comfort at the beginning of the session received a mean rating of 4.124; item 10 which dealt with comfort at the end of the session

received a mean rating of 4.559. Items 1 and 2 which were concerned with understanding CARES and the reason for Phase I received 4.3+ ratings. The statements about the activity of Phase I itself (Items 3, 4, 6, and 8) all received mean ratings of 4.2+. The projection that the Phase I experience would be helpful in future work (Item 9) received a mean rating of 4.371.

The second dimension of process -- the quality of the Phase I experience -- is supported by this overwhelmingly positive response to this evaluative questionaire.

TABLE II

EVALUATION OF PHASE I

(n=202)

The following list of statements attempts to describe an experience in Phase I of CARES. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement by circling the appropriate letters of the following scale:

SA (5) STRONGLY AGREE — A(4) AGREE — N(3) NEITHER AGREE/NOR DISAGREE — D(2) DISAGREE — SD(1) STRONGLY DISAGREE

Mean	Standard Deviation			1(SD) f	1(SD) %	2(D) f	2(D) %	3(N) f	3(N) %	4(A) f	4(A) %	5(SA) f	5(SA) %
4.381	.697	1.	I understand the purpose of the Phase I activity.	1	0.5	2	1.0	13	6.4	89	44.1	97	48
4.356	.685	2.	I understand the purpose of the CARES project.	1	0.5	3	1.5	9	4.5	99	49.0	90	44.6
4.297	.962	3.	I felt most of the activities were meaningful to me.	6	3.0	5	2.5	11	5.4	76	37.6	103	51.0
4.347	.803	4.	I learned to communicate more openly with other people.	1	0.5	5	2.5	21	10.4	71	35.1	104	51.5
4.124	1.093	5.	I felt comfortable participating from the very beginning.	4	2.00	19	9.4	18	8.9	63	31.2	97	48.0
4.584	.578	6.	The grouping arrangements were helpful in facilitating the activity.	0	0	2	1.0	3	3.0	72	35.6	125	61.9
4.035	1.053	7.	There was enough time to complete the different activities.	7	3.5	19	9.4	9	4.5	92	45.5	75	37.0
4.282	.867	8.	I understand the directions for the different activities.	1	0.5	5	2.5	4	2.0	103	51.0	86	42.6
4.371	.716	9.	This experience will be helpful to me in my work.	1	0.5	1	0.5	19	9.4	82	40.6	99	49.0
4.559	.752	10.	I felt comfortable toward the end of the experience.	2	1.0	0	0	0	0	71	35.1	127	62.9

Product Objective 1.2 After participating in a human development workshop using an adaptation of the "We Agree" activities, 70% of the school personnel, students, and community representatives will exhibit improved self concepts as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

TABLE III

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE (TSCS)

(N=181)

	f	%
More positive post scores	135	73
Unchanged post scores	7	4
Less positive post scores	39	23

There is no question that the Phase I activity resulted in some immediate positive enhancement of self. More than the projected 70 per cent (73 per cent) achieved a positive move in self-concept. Objective 1.2 was clearly met.

Product Objective 1.3 After participating in a human development workshop using adaptations of the "We Agree" activities, 50% of the school personnel, students and community representatives will exhibit positive attitude changes as measured by a semantic differential. (The semantic differential instrument is designed to measure specific dimensions of attitudes such as ethnic stero-typing, perception of self and others, and perception of school.)

TABLE IV

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Measure of Attitudes - Pre and Post
Phase I Participants*

	More Positive		Same		Less Positive	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Education (n=173)	86	50	34	20	53	30
School (n=163)	92	56	22	14	49	30
I (Myself) (n=172)	98	57	31	18	43	25
Most Other People (n=167)	92	55	26	16	49	29
People of Other Races (n=159)	88	55	28	18	43	27

The above table clearly indicates that objective 1.3 was met. In each of the five areas - education, school, I (myself), most other people, and people of other races -

*Only those participants on which there was complete information on the pre and post instruments were included in this analysis. The validity of the semantic differential rests largely on the assumption that the respondent understands the rating process. Any instruments that were not completely filled in were dropped from consideration.

the percentage of participants whose attitudes improved was fifty or more. The attitude toward self was increased by 57 per cent of the participants. Attitudes toward most other people and people of other races were more positive for 55 per cent of the participants. While attitudes toward education were more positive for only 50 per cent of the participants, attitudes toward school were more positive for 56 per cent of the participants. In every case 30 per cent or fewer of the participants experienced any negative move in attitude. An examination of the raw data (Appendix C) reveals that both positive and negative changes were, for the most part, fairly small in nature. This kind of change is, of course, to be expected in such a short period of time. It is important to note, however, that the majority of the participants changed in a postive direction, and an even larger majority either made positive change or no change at all.

Process Objective 2.1 In June and July, 1974, a core of 22 Social Studies teachers, 8 students from the pilot secondary schools, and 2 supervisors who participated in the human development workshop will engage in a curriculum action lab for a period of 3 hours per day for 30 days as evidenced by attendance records.

TABLE V

PHASE II PARTICIPANTS

Social Studies
(n=31)

	Sessions Attended	Sessions Absent
Supervisors (n=2)	64*	0
Teachers (n=21)	628*	10
Students (n=8)	204	36

*Four teachers, who served as leaders and two supervisors, attended two additional sessions

This participation objective was not fully met. Only 21 of the 22 teachers were available to participate; however, they attended consistently. The maximum attendance of teachers projected by the objective of 30, three-hour sessions would have been 630, and the total is only two less than that objective. The attendance of students was somewhat less consistent.

Process Objective 2.2 In June and July, 1974, a core of 22 language arts teachers, 8 students from the pilot secondary schools, and 2 supervisors who participated in the human development workshop will engage in a curriculum action lab for a period of 3 hours per day for 15 days as evidenced by attendance records.

TABLE VI

PHASE II PARTICIPANTS

Language Arts
(n=35)

	Sessions Attended	Sessions Absent
Supervisors (n=2)	39*	1
Teachers (n=23)	360*	1
Parochial School Teachers (n=2)	30	0
Students (n=8)	101	19

*Supervisors and some teachers who served as leaders attended two to three extra sessions.

The participation objective for language arts participants was met or exceeded by every group except the students. An additional teacher participated in the teacher group and two parochial school teachers attended each session.

Process Objective 2.3 In June, 1974, a core of 11 music and/or art teachers, 4 students from the pilot secondary schools, and 1 supervisor who participated in the human development workshop will engage in a curriculum action lab for a period of 3 hours per day for 10 days as evidenced by attendance records.

TABLE VII

PHASE II PARTICIPANTS

Music-Art
(n=14)

	Sessions Attended	Sessions Absent
Supervisor (n=1)	14*	0
Teachers (n=9)	112*	0
Students (n=4)	39	1

*The supervisor and three teachers attended four extra sessions.

While the attendance record of this group is outstanding, the objective as stated in the original proposal was not met. Nine rather than 11 teachers were involved. This discrepancy was a result of the shifting of teachers brought about by the court order being implemented at the time. The low rate of absenses should be mentioned.

Process Objective 2.4 In June, 1974, a core of 11 science teachers, 4 students from the pilot secondary schools, and 1 supervisor who participated in the human development workshop will engage in a curriculum action lab for a period of 3 hours per day for 10 days as evidenced by the attendance records.

TABLE VIII

PHASE II PARTICIPANTS

Science
(n=17)

	Sessions Attended	Sessions Absent
Supervisor (n=1)	14*	0
Teachers (n=11)	111*	7
Parochial Teachers (n=1)	10	0
Students (n=4)	36	4

*The supervisors and two teachers who served as leaders attended four extra sessions.

The objective of participation was met by the science group for every participant group except students. The 111 sessions attended by teachers exceeded the 110 projected - plus the full participation of a parochial school teacher. While the students had four absences, there was still rather full participation from them.

Process Objective 2.5 In June, 1974, a core of 11 math teachers, 4 students from the pilot secondary schools, and 1 supervisor who participated in the human development workshop will engage in a curriculum action lab for a period of 3 hours per day for 10 days as evidenced by attendance records.

TABLE IX

PHASE II PARTICIPANTS

Mathematics
(n=16)

	Sessions Attended	Sessions Absent
Supervisor (n=1)	14*	0
Teachers (n=11)	122*	0
Students (n=4)	40	0

*The supervisor and three teachers who served as leaders attended four extra sessions.

The objective of Participation was fully met as stated and exceeded. The 122 sessions of teachers exceeded the projected 110 sessions by 12 sessions.

Further evaluation of the process objectives related to the Phase II was conducted by the administration of an evaluation instrument post Phase II. The instrument contained 41 items which were statements to be responded to on a strongly agree to strongly disagree scale. (A full presentation of the responses to this instrument appear in Appendix D.) For the purpose of clear discussion, these

items have been logically grouped in five concepts: involvement, participation, communication, organizational climate, and growth and commitment.

Table X presents items which relate to personal and other involvement. The aspect of personal involvement is clearly supported by all mean ratings exceeding 4.1. The strongest agreement related to personal involvement centered around the ideas of "feeling involved" and importance of involvement.

The participants also supported the appropriateness of the involvement of supervisors, parents, students, and support personnel (mean ratings of 4.3+). However, the mean rating of 2.959 indicates a decided neutrality regarding the equality of involvement in Phase II.

TABLE X

INVOLVEMENT: PERSONAL AND OTHER

Means and Standard Deviations

(N=74)

		Mean	Standard Deviations
	Personal		
12.	I felt involved in Phase I of CARES.	4.473	.555
21.	I felt involved in Phase II of CARES.	4.595	.521
15.	My involvement in CARES was appropriate.	4.446	.600
1.	My involvement in CARES is important to me.	4.662	.476
18.	My involvement in CARES was important to the project.	4.324	.500
22.	My involvement in CARES was important to other people.	4.162	.642
39.	My Phase II group made me feel very involved in the CARES process.	4.482	.602
	Other		
6.	The supervisors' involvement in CARES was appropriate.	4.743	.493
27.	The parents' involvement in CARES was appropriate.	4.432	.499
32.	The students' involvement in CARES was appropriate.	4.595	.494
29.	The involvement of the support personnel (school secretaries, lunchroom workers, maids, and janitors) in Phase I was appropriate.	4.432	.704
30.	The participants in my Phase II group were as involved as I.	2.959	1.103

TABLE XI

PARTICIPATION

Means and Standard Deviations

(N=74)

		Mean	Standard Deviation
40.	I felt free to say exactly what I thought.	4.405	.720
25.	I was expected to say exactly what I thought.	3.973	.875
16.	My suggestions were genuinely desired.	4.284	.652
33.	My contributions were genuinely needed.	3.946	.680
2.	I contributed to the project.	4.473	.503
4.	My ideas were always given a hearing.	4.027	.965
17.	In my Phase II group, we participated openly.	4.649	.584
28.	In my Phase II group, we participated freely.	4.541	.601

Table XI presents responses to items which focused on the participation level in Phase II. All items were generally agreed with. The two lowest mean ratings were only slightly below 4.0. Therefore, the level of participation was open as rated by the participants.

TABLE XII

COMMUNICATION

Means and Standard Deviations

(N=74)

		Mean	Standard Deviation
5.	I could communicate with people "like me" in the project.	4.432	.575
14.	I could communicate with people "different from me" in the project.	4.419	.597
9.	I could communicate with the supervisor in my group.	4.730	.477
26.	I could communicate with the CARES leadership staff.	4.514	.530
11.	I could not communicate with everybody in the project.	2.108	.973

The five items which related to communication are presented in Table XII. Clearly, the participants felt they could communicate with people "like them," "different from them," supervisors, and the CARES leadership group (mean ratings of 4.4+). The one communication item to receive general disagreement was the negatively-worded item regarding communication with everybody in the project. The participants rejected this statement; 77 per cent of the respondents disagreed with that statement, supporting the general open communication.

TABLE XIII

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

Means and Standard Deviations

(N=74)

		Mean	Standard Deviation
37.	There were no set expectations for the project.	2.486	1.101
3.	Leadership personnel were honest about wanting the involvement of participants.	4.676	.500
20.	I feel that the CARES staff (leadership people)really believe in the concept of the project.	4.662	.556
38.	Participants were involved in decisions of importance to the project.	4.338	.476
7.	The degree to which I was involved in CARES was a function of circumstances.	2.473	.879
10.	The degree to which I was involved in CARES was my choice.	4.311	.681
24.	I would have preferred having experts develop the teaching models over the process used in CARES.	1.824	.783

The feelings regarding the organizational climate were decided. The participants indicated their disagreement with the suggestion of having experts develop the teaching models. (mean rating of 1.824). They also rejected the ideas that the project had no set expectations and that involvement was due to chance (mean ratings of 2.486 and 2.473). The responses to these items support that the organizational climate was positive and productive.

TABLE XIV

GROWTH AND COMMITMENT

Means and Standard Deviations

(N=74)

		Mean	Standard Deviation
19.	I CARE more about the objectives of of the project after our work together.	4.514	.602
23.	My attitude toward CARES concept is more positive than ever.	4.419	.597
13.	I am committed to the purpose of the CARES project.	4.514	.555
34.	Being aware of cultural differences is more important to me since CARES.	4.311	.701
31.	I feel committed to an ethnic-oriented curriculum, at least partly because I share the CARES concept.	4.324	.500
36.	The teaching models approach to curriculum used in CARES will provide appropriate suggestions for implementation of ideas growing out of the project.	4.378	.542
35.	My teaching methods will be more flexible as a result of CARES.	4.405	.702
41.	I feel a sense of responsibility for assuming my part in the implementation of the CARES concept in my classroom in 1974-75.	4.635	.512
8.	I will assume some responsibility for the implementation of the CARES concept at my school in 1974-75.	4.568	.575

The nine items in Table XIV could well be the most important in evaluating the process for they focused the growth participants felt they had achieved and the commitments they had made as a result of participating in Phase II. With mean ratings of 4.3 or better for all items, it is clear that the participants agree with the growth and

commitment statements. They affirm commitment to and growth in the CARES concept of cultural awareness, ethnic-oriented curricula. They affirm their own change in attitude, their sense of responsibility for implementing these new attitudes, and their growth as a flexible teacher.

These evaluative responses support the quality of the process of Phase II. Therefore, objectives 2.1 through 2.5 were met both in terms of attendance and participation in a growing, learning experience.

Product Objective 2.6 After participating in a human development workshop and curriculum lab collaborations, each group of participants will develop teaching models or approaches to be used with teachers and students, the purpose of which will be to translate the concerns for ethnicity and/or positive and accepting personal attitudes directly into their school experiences. The product will be evaluated by measuring the models against the following general criteria:

(1) The product will exist in a form through which it can be communicated to its target population.

(2) The product will have built-in procedures for implementation and evaluation.

(3) The product will be designed to be followed by thematic sessions during the 1974-75 school year.

There is one major way in which the achievement of this objective is documented--a jury of evaluation of the models:

The jury evaluation was conducted by a group composed of three supervisors and four teachers. The following guideline was used:

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATERS

Manual _____

Rater _____

Please use the following scale to rate these manuals:

EXCELLENT	GOOD	ADEQUATE	LESS THAN ADEQUATE	POOR
1	2	3	4	5

____1. How well does the manual communicate?

____ Organization

____ Writing style (clarity)

____ Directions for implementation

____ Content variety

____2. How well does the manual have evaluation techniques built-in?

____ Instruments

____ Instruction

____3. How strong a relationship can you draw between the manual and CARES (Phase I and thematic sessions)? Give examples.

The evaluator was present during the jury examination of the model and instructed the raters in the use of the rating guide. The items indented under items 1 and 2 were provided to assist the raters. The raters then assigned an overall rating to that item on the basis of the ratings of the smaller components. Ratings of the third item

required reasons for assigning a value label on that item. Using an Analysis of Variance Model (Ebel, 1951), a reliability of ratings was calculated (.716) as well as a reliability of average ratings (.946). (See Appendix for full data on reliability coefficients.) These figures indicate that the independent ratings of this jury are reliable enough to be considered accurate ratings of the models.

TABLE XV

RATINGS OF CARES MODELS

Average Ratings

	Communication	Evaluation	CARES Concept
	(Item 1)	(Item 2)	(Item 3)
Social Studies	1.57	1.12	1.20
Music and Art	2.29	2.17	2.20
Language Arts II	1.14	1.57	1.00
Language Arts I	1.29	1.86	1.33
Science	1.43	1.29	1.40
Mathematics	1.14	1.00	1.43

These average ratings indicate that the jury felt these manuals met the criteria of communicating, of having built-in evaluation techniques, and of relating to the CARES concept. No average rating was higher than 2.29, indicating a value judgement of less than good, better than adequate. No single rating of higher than 3 was given any model on any item.

Therefore, the jury rating of the models is evidence that Objective 2.6 was met.

Product Objective 2.7 After participating in a human development workshop and curriculum action lab training sessions, 50% of the teachers will exhibit improved attitudes toward the teaching process as measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory.

TABLE XVI
MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY (MTAI)
Phase II Participants
(n=41)

	f	%
More positive attitudes	29	71
Maintained attitudes	0	0
Less positive attitudes	12	29

Of the forty-one participants from Phase II on which there was complete and reliable MTAI data, 71 per cent were more positive at the conclusion of the experience. Therefore, Objective 2.7 was met.

Process Objective 3.1 During the 1974-75 school year, 80% of the teachers in the pilot schools will participate in 2 one-day (Saturday) thematic sessions conducted by curriculum action lab teams as evidenced by attendance records.

TABLE XVII
ATTENDANCE AT THEMATIC SESSIONS
First Session, November 23, 1974

	Faculty	Attending	Percentage
Carver Elementary	14	8	.57
Floyd Elementary	13	8	.62
Floyd Jr. High	28	13	.46
Forest Ave. Elementary	14	10	.71
Lanier High	79	30	.38
McIntyre Jr. High	29	12	.41
Satelite & Parochial Schools	17		
Supervisors, etc.	10		

Second Session, April 19, 1975

Carver Elementary	14	7	.50
Floyd Elementary	13	6	.46
Floyd Jr. High	28	10	.36
Forest Ave, Elementary	14	6	.42
Lanier High	79	28	.35
McIntyre Jr. High	29	11	.38
Satelite & Parochial Schools	15		
Supervisors, etc.	10		

The above table clearly illustrates that the criterion of 80 per cent attendance was not met.

Product Objective 3.2 During the 1974-75 school year, 100% of the teachers who participated in Phases I and II and 50% of those who did not will implement CARES approach and content in the disciplines addressed by the project as evidenced by the evaluation procedures within each CARES teaching model.

The data anticipated in determination of Objective 3.2 did not materialize. Into each of the CARES models there were built evaluation instruments that teachers could use to evaluate the models from both the teacher and student point-of-view. However, there was no specific procedure to facilitate the teacher's completing these evaluative instruments. At the second thematic session, extra copies of these instruments were distributed to those in attendance who had copies of the CARES models. A total of 68 packets of materials were distributed; a total of 29 were returned. This return of 43 per cent is far short of the anticipated objective of all who had access to CARES models. However, there are some additional points which should be made: (1) Only teachers who participated in Phase II received copies of the CARES models. (2) There was no established procedure of facilitating the return of these evaluation instruments. (3) The evaluation instruments were requested at the end of the school year - an exceedingly demanding time. (4) The evaluation instruments which were returned were completed with care

for there is a wide range of responses and abundant open-ended comments regarding the value of the models and suggestions for improvement.

While objective 3.2 must be considered not met, the fault of its non-achievement lies more in the evaluation procedure than in the possibility that the materials were not actually used.

Product Objective 3.3 At the conclusion of this project the teachers in each of the target groups, (1) Phase I participants, (2) Phase I and II participants, and (3) all teachers who implemented CARES teaching models will exhibit the development of more positive attitudes as measured by a semantic differential instrument.

TABLE XVIII
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL
Measure of Attitudes - Post Project

Phase I and II Participants*

	More** Positive		Same		Less Positive	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Education (n=113)	99	88	5	4	9	8
School (n=103)	97	94	2	2	4	4
I (Myself) (n=116)	107	92	7	6	2	2
Most Other People (n=106)	102	97	3	3	1	1
People of Other Races (n=102)	95	94	2	2	5	5

*Only those participants on which there was complete information on pre and post Phase I and post project were included in this analysis. A total of 155 post project instruments were mailed to Phase I and II participants; 126 of these were returned. A return of 81 percent is considered very responsive; these instruments were also completed at the end of the school year which sheds even more positive light on such a good return.

**More positive responses include responses that are higher than either pre or post Phase I responses, thereby focusing on change in attitude throughout the project year.

There is an implied criterion of 100 per cent in Objective 3.3 While that criterion is <u>not</u> met, the

majority of respondents - 88 per cent, the lowest - did evidence attitudes more positive than either their pre or post Phase I attitude. The percentage of more positive responses ranged from a low of 88 for education to a high of 97 for most other people. The objective is not met as stated; however, the data do support that positive attitude change did occur in a majority of cases.

Product Objective 3.4 At the conclusion of this project, systematic classroom observations in each of the target groups (1) Phase I teachers (2) Phase II teachers and (3) teachers implementing CARES teaching models will exhibit significantly greater variety and flexibility in teaching strategies than will a control group of non-involved classrooms.

Two approaches were used in collecting the observational data to determine whether or not objective 3.4 were met: the natural history approach, an anthropological group structure system, and the Reciprocal Category System, an interaction analysis observation system.

The Natural History Method

Because the natural history method is a tremendously difficult method in which to train reliable observers, it was decided to use only one observer - Dr. Michael Littleford of Auburn University. Dr. Littleford's dissertation study and substantial subsequent research utilized the natural history method. While she observed only two teachers and her data cannot be considered conclusive in an evaluation - research sense, it can certainly shed an additional view on the teaching strategies and/or interaction studied more intensively by use of the interaction analysis approach.

The two teachers Dr. Littleford observed were volunteers. One teacher had participated in Phase I and II

and both thematic sessions; the second teacher had attended only Phase I. The analysis of the natural history data revolved around drawing conclusions from a running account of the interactions and transactions that transpire during the observed time period. In both classes, the discussion was begun with an introduction of the observer and a discussion of the day's activities. Four particular aspects of the situations may be compared: (1) social control, (2) pupil-pupil interaction, (3) teacher-pupil interaction, and (4) formal-informal interaction. In each of these four areas, the teacher who had participated in Phase II and did implement many of the CARES concepts was more flexible. The social control of the classroom was shared by the students and teacher with the teacher playing a facilitating role; other teacher maintained control over all that occurred in the classroom. There was intensive pupil to pupil interaction (on the topic of the day) and great flexibility in the teacher to pupil and pupil to teacher interaction. There was also a mixture of formal and informal interactions in the CARES teacher's classroom. The other teacher discouraged pupil to pupil interaction, controlled teacher to pupil interaction, and restricted informal interaction.

The CARES teacher was clearly more flexible in light of Dr. Littleford's observation. This observation is not to say that one is better than the other--only more flexible! Both teachers are considered excellent teachers. (See Appendix G for illustrations of the data from which these conclusions were drawn.)

The Interaction Analysis Method

Eighteen teachers were observed using the Reciprocal Category's System (RCS), an adaptation of Flanders interaction analysis. Four observers were trained by the evaluator who has had extensive experience in training observers in the use of the RCS as well as extensive experience in using the RCS in research. For the purpose of this data collection, the time-limit of recording every three seconds was not strictly observed. The observers were, rather, focusing on the flexibility of verbal interaction. Nine CARES teachers and nine non-CARES teachers were observed. The matrices which were plotted for each of these 18 teachers were compared, and the following general conclusions can be drawn: (See Appendix G for plotted matrices and summary.)

1. CARES and non-CARES teachers tend to dominate the classroom verbal interaction; that is, teacher talk predominates in the interaction.

2. CARES teachers exhibit more facilitative teacher verbal behavior that do non-CARES teachers.

3. Students of CARES teachers exhibit more variety in their verbal behaviors than do the students of non-CARES teachers.

4. The student to student interaction and student to teacher interaction is more predominant in CARES classrooms.

On the basis of the observational data collected and analyzed, Objective 3.4 was clearly met.

Process Objective 4.1 During the 1974-75 school year, students in the pilot schools will be involved in teaching-learning experiences in the CARES project as evidenced by attendance records.

No specific attempt was made to document this particular process objective. While attendance records were readily available, the meeting of the process objective is clearly apparent. One procedure was used, however, to be certain that attendance was not an interfering variable. In measuring product objectives 4.2 and 4.3, group data were utilized. Essentially, the groups (or classes) were being considered the units of measure. This approach produces much more stable and generalizable data.

Process objective 4.1 was clearly met.

Product Objective 4.2 By June of 1975, 80% of the students in the pilot schools will demonstrate an improved attitude toward the school environment as measured by a semantic differential. The semantic differential instrument is designed to measure specific dimensions of attitude such as ethnic stereotyping, perception of self and others, and perception of school.

TABLE XIX

Semantic Differential Measure

Changes in Attitude

	CARES (N=26)				NON-CARES (N=28)			
	+		-		+		-	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Education	7	27	19	73	15	54	13	46
School	5	19	21	81	9	32	19	68
I (Myself)	10	38	16	62	17	61	11	39
Most Other People	8	31	18	69	12	43	16	57
People of Other Races	6	23	20	77	14	50	14	50

This table presents the number and percentage of classes -- both CARES and NON-CARES which experienced positive and negative attitude changes. Clearly the criterion of 80 per cent positive change was not achieved. Upon first examination, the NON-CARES group appears to exhibit most positive changes, with as much as 61 per cent positive movement on one variable. However, t-tests of significance difference were performed to determine whether or not these were important or chance differences.

The objective of improved attitudes was measured for both CARES and NON-CARES groups. The mean scores for each of these units are presented in Appendix H. The t-test for significant difference was calculated for pre and post measures as well as difference scores.

TABLE XX

Semantic Differential Attitude Measure

t-values

	Pre	Post	Difference
Education	1.188	.262	1.566
School	.786	.576	.427
I (Myself)	1.941	.170	1.394
Most Other People	.106	.835	1.230
People of Other Races	1.989	.013	1.780

No t-value was significant at the .05 level with 52 degrees of freedom. Apparently, as this instrument indicates the group was essentially the same initially and post school year, and the differences were not significantly different.

Product Objective 4.2 was not met.

Product Objective 4.3 At the conclusion of the project, 75% of the students, in the pilot schools will exhibit an improved self concept as measured by the 10X Self Appraisal Inventory and/or the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

TABLE XXI

Self Concept Difference Scores

	CARES				NON-CARES			
	+		-		+		-	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Tennessee Self Concept Scale	4	36	7	64	5	55	4	45
Self Appraisal Form	6	40	9	60	7	39	11	61

On the basis of the pre and post self concept data gathered on CARES and non-CARES students, product objective 4.3 was not met. To determine whether or not there were significant differences in these scores, t-tests were calculated.

TABLE XXII

t-values for Self Concept Data

	Pre	Post	Difference
Tennessee Self Concept Scale	.831	.881	.247
Self Appraisal Form	.475	.733	1.056

None of the above t-values is significant. Product objective 4.3 was not met. (See Appendix I for data.)

Product Objective 4.4 At the conclusion of the project, an increase in academic achievement will be established by comparing a stratified sample of California Achievement Test scores among pilot school groups, intra-system control groups, and extra-system control groups.

TABLE XXIII

California Achievement Test Data

Tenth Grade

CARES, non-CARES, EXTRA-SYSTEM CONTROL

	Reading	Mathematics
ANOVA (f-value, df=2,372)	3.432	5.663*
CARES vs non-CARES (t-value, df=248)	2.506*	3.188*
CARES vs CONTROL (t-value, df=248)	1.868	2.541*

*Significant at the .05 level.

The analysis of variance comparison indicates that there is a significant difference between the three groups on mathematics achievement, but a non-significant difference in the area of reading. The most crucial question is whether or not the CARES students achieved significantly higher than the non-CARES group or the extra-system control group. The CARES students' achievement is significantly higher than the non-CARES group in both reading and mathematics and significantly higher than the

extra-system control group in mathematics.

TABLE XXIV

California Achievement Test Data

Fourth Grade

CARES, NON-CARES, EXTRA-SYSTEM CONTROL

	Reading	Mathematics
ANOVA (f-value, df=2,162)	30.844**	19.255**
CARES vs NON-CARES (t-value, df=108)	6.989**	5.736**
CARES vs CONTROL (t-value, df=108)	0.337	0.120

**Significant at the .01 level.

The analysis of variance comparison indicates significant difference between groups. The t-tests indicate that the CARES group scored significantly higher than did the non-CARES group but not significantly higher than the extra-system control group.

From the tenth and fourth grade CAT samples, support for the accomplishment of objective 4.4 is strong. While the CARES sample was not significantly higher in every comparison, it was significantly higher in all intra-system comparisons and one extra-system comparison. These data support the meeting of objective 4.4.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A: INSTRUMENTS

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ATTITUDE MEASURE

Instructions: Listed in the center of the following pages are words that relate to your feelings about school. Following each of these words is a list of adjective pairs with seven spaces between the adjectives.

Think of each word as it applies to the way you feel; then place an X in a space between the adjective pairs. The nearer the space is to an adjective, the more that adjective describes your feelings. For example, if the concept is football and you think football is neither bad nor good, you would place your X in the center space--equally distant from bad and good.

good___:___:___:___:___:___:___bad

If, however, you think football is very good, you would place the X in the space closest to good.

good___:___:___:___:___:___:___bad

Your responses should be rapid. Don't hesitate, simply read the concept and adjective pairs and place your X in the position that most nearly describes your feelings.

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ATTITUDE MEASURE

EDUCATION

good___:___:___:___:___:___:___bad

valuable___:___:___:___:___:___:___worthless

happy___:___:___:___:___:___:___sad

fair ___:___:___:___:___:___:___unfair

honest___:___:___:___:___:___:___dishonest

relaxed___:___:___:___:___:___:___tense

I (MYSELF)

good___:___:___:___:___:___:___bad

valuable___:___:___:___:___:___:___worthless

happy___:___:___:___:___:___:___sad

fair___:___:___:___:___:___:___unfair

honest___:___:___:___:___:___:___dishonest

relaxed___:___:___:___:___:___:___tense

MOST OTHER PEOPLE

good___:___:___:___:___:___:___bad

valuable___:___:___:___:___:___:___worthless

happy___:___:___:___:___:___:___sad

fair___:___:___:___:___:___:___unfair

honest___:___:___:___:___:___:___dishonest

relaxed___:___:___:___:___:___:___tense

SCHOOL

good___:___:___:___:___:___:___bad

valuable___:___:___:___:___:___:___worthless

happy___:___:___:___:___:___:___sad

fair___:___:___:___:___:___:___unfair

honest___:___:___:___:___:___:___dishonest

relaxed___:___:___:___:___:___:___tense

PEOPLE OF OTHER RACES

good___:___:___:___:___:___:___bad

valuable___:___:___:___:___:___:___worthless

happy___:___:___:___:___:___:___sad

fair___:___:___:___:___:___:___unfair

honest___:___:___:___:___:___:___dishonest

relaxed___:___:___:___:___:___:___tense

IDENTIFICATION NUMBER____

EVALUATION OF PHASE I

The following list of statements attempts to describe an experience in Phase I of CARES. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement by circling the appropriate letters of the following scale:

SA	A	N	D	SD
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEITHER AGREE/NOR DISAGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE

SA A N D SD 1. I understand the purpose of Phase 1 activity.

SA A N D SD 2. I understand the purpose of the CARES project.

SA A N D SD 3. I felt most of the activities were meaningful to me.

SA A N D SD 4. I learned to communicate more openly with other people.

SA A N D SD 5. I felt comfortable participating from the very beginning.

SA A N D SD 6. The grouping arrangements were helpful in facilitating the activity.

SA A N D SD 7. There was enough time to complete the different activities.

SA A N D SD 8. I understood the directions for the different activities.

SA A N D SD 9. This experience will be helpful to me in my work.

SA A N D SD 10. I felt comfortable toward the end of the experience.

11. The experience should be changed in these ways:

12. I especially liked these things about the experience:

(If additional space is needed for questions 11 and 12 please use the back.)

Identification Number _____

Instructions: Listed in the center of the following pages are words that relate to your feelings about schools and education. Following each of these words is a list of adjective pairs with seven spaces between the adjectives.

Think of each word as it applies to the way you feel; then place an X in a space between the adjective pairs that most nearly corresponds to your feelings.

Example:

LEARNING

good____:____:____:____:____:____bad
valuable____:____:____:____:____:____worthless
fair____:____:____:____:____:____unfair

Place an X somewhere along the line for each pair of adjectives. Respond to each topic word.

Thank you for your cooperation.

EDUCATION

good____:____:____:____:____:____bad

large____:____:____:____:____:____small

strong____:____:____:____:____:____weak

valuable____:____:____:____:____:____worthless

happy____:____:____:____:____:____sad

active____:____:____:____:____:____passive

fair____:____:____:____:____:____unfair

honest____:____:____:____:____:____dishonest

I (MYSELF)

good____:____:____:____:____:____:____bad

large____:____:____:____:____:____:____small

strong____:____:____:____:____:____:____weak

valuable____:____:____:____:____:____:____worthless

happy____:____:____:____:____:____:____sad

active____:____:____:____:____:____:____passive

fair____:____:____:____:____:____:____unfair

honest____:____:____:____:____:____:____dishonest

MOST OTHER PEOPLE

good____:____:____:____:____:____:____bad

large____:____:____:____:____:____:____small

strong____:____:____:____:____:____:____weak

valuable____:____:____:____:____:____:____worthless

happy____:____:____:____:____:____:____sad

active____:____:____:____:____:____:____passive

fair____:____:____:____:____:____:____unfair

honest____:____:____:____:____:____:____dishonest

SCHOOL

good____:____:____:____:____:____:____bad

large____:____:____:____:____:____:____small

strong____:____:____:____:____:____:____weak

valuable____:____:____:____:____:____:____worthless

happy____:____:____:____:____:____:____sad

active____:____:____:____:____:____:____passive

fair____:____:____:____:____:____:____unfair

honest____:____:____:____:____:____:____dishonest

PEOPLE OF OTHER RACES

good____:____:____:____:____:____:____bad

large____:____:____:____:____:____:____small

strong____:____:____:____:____:____:____weak

valuable____:____:____:____:____:____:____worthless

happy____:____:____:____:____:____:____sad

active____:____:____:____:____:____:____passive

fair____:____:____:____:____:____:____unfair

honest____:____:____:____:____:____:____dishonest

CARES PARTICIPATION

The following statements present feelings about involvement in CARES. Please examine them and circle the response which most nearly reflects your personal feelings. The scale is

SA (Strongly Agree) - this response indicates that the statement is an accurate description of your feeling and that you feel strongly about it.

A (Agree) - this response indicates that the statement is an accurate description of your feeling.

NA/D (Neither Agree nor Disagree) - this response indicates that the statement is neither an accurate nor an inaccurate description of how you feel or that you simply haven't enough information for a decision.

D (Disagree) - this response indicates that the statement is not an accurate description of your feeling.

SD (Strongly Disagree) - this response indicates that the statement is not an accurate description of your feeling and that you feel strongly about it.

SA A NA/D D SD 1. My involvement in CARES is important to me.
SA A NA/D D SD 2. I contributed to the project.
SA A NA/D D SD 3. Leadership personnel were honest about wanting the involvement of participants.
SA A NA/D D SD 4. My ideas were not always given a hearing.
SA A NA/D D SD 5. I could communicate with people "like me" in the project.
SA A NA/D D SD 6. It was right for the supervisors to be involved in CARES.

SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	7.	The degree to which I was involved in CARES was a function of circumstances.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	8.	I will assume some responsibility for the implementation of the CARES concept at my school in 1974-75.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	9.	I could communicate with the supervisor in my group.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	10.	The degree to which I was involved in CARES was my choice.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	11.	I could not communicate with everybody in the project.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	12.	I felt involved in Phase I of CARES.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	13.	I am committed to the purpose of the CARES project.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	14.	I could communicate with people "different from me" in the project.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	15.	It was right that I was involved in CARES.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	16.	My suggestions were genuinely desired.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	17.	In my Phase II group, we participated openly.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	18.	My involvement in CARES was important to the project.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	19.	I care more about the objectives of the project after our work together.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	20.	I feel that the CARES staff (leadership people) really believe in the concept of the project.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	21.	I felt involved in Phase II of CARES.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	22.	My involvement in CARES was important to other people.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	23.	My attitude toward the CARES concept is more positive than ever.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	24.	I would have preferred having experts develop the teaching models over the process used in CARES.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	25.	I was not expected to say exactly what I thought.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	26.	I could communicate with the CARES leadership staff.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	27.	It was right that parents were involved.

SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	28.	In my Phase II group, we participated freely.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	29.	It was right that support personnel (school secretaries, lunchroom workers, maids, and janitors) were involved in Phase I.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	30.	Some participants in my Phase II group were not as involved as I.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	31.	I feel committed to an ethnic-oriented curriculum, at least partly because I share the CARES concept.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	32.	It was right that the students were involved in CARES.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	33.	My contributions were genuinely needed.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	34.	Being aware of cultural differences is more important to me since CARES.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	35.	My teaching methods will be more flexible as a result of CARES.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	36.	The teaching models approach to curriculum development used in CARES will provide appropriate suggestions for implementation of ideas growing out of the project.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	37.	There were no set expectations for the project.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	38.	Participants were involved in decisions of importance to the project.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	39.	My Phase II group made me feel very involved in the CARES process.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	40.	I felt free to say exactly what I thought.
SA	A	NA/D	D	SD	41.	I feel a sense of responsibility for assuming my part in the implementation of the CARES concept in my classroom in 1974-75.

SELF APPRAISAL INVENTORY

Instructions: After reading the question, indicate your answer in the columns to the left. The first column is for yes; the second, no.

yes	no		
___	___	1.	Are you easy to like?
___	___	2.	Do you often get in trouble at home?
___	___	3.	Are you an important person to your family?
___	___	4.	Do you like being just what you are?
___	___	5.	Are you a good reader?
___	___	6.	Do you wish you were a different person?
___	___	7.	Are other students often unfriendly to you?
___	___	8.	Do you often want to give up in school?
___	___	9.	Can you wait your turn easily?
___	___	10.	Do your friends usually do what you say?
___	___	11.	Are there times when you would like to run away from home?
___	___	12.	Are you good in your school work?
___	___	13.	Do you often break your promises?
___	___	14.	Do most people have fewer friends than you?
___	___	15.	Are you a good person?
___	___	16.	Are most people better liked than you?
___	___	17.	Would you like to stay home instead of going to school?
___	___	18.	Are the things you do at school very easy for you?
___	___	19.	Do you often feel ashamed of yourself?
___	___	20.	Do you like being you?
___	___	21.	Do you forget most of what you learn?
___	___	22.	Do you feel lonely very often?
___	___	23.	If you have something to say, do you usually say it?
___	___	24.	Do you get upset easily at home?
___	___	25.	Do you like the teacher to ask you questions in front of the other students?
___	___	26.	Do the other students in the class think you are a good worker?
___	___	27.	Does being with other people bother you?
___	___	28.	Are you hard to be friends with?
___	___	29.	Would you rather be with friends who are younger than you?
___	___	30.	Do you find it hard to talk to your class?
___	___	31.	Are most students able to finish their school work more quickly than you?

APPENDIX B

Tennessee Self Concept Data

PRE	POST	PRE	POST
323	361	364	326
330	337	310	273
325	347	327	344
425	417	396	400
394	397	383	384
355	380	377	397
373	384	402	419
353	368	323	325
368	381	355	365
348	372	349	351
362	352	321	326
363	360	349	397
396	408	420	420
366	380	298	322
353	363	292	284
376	368	385	396
312	323	358	362
375	397	337	348
388	397	386	384
389	401	364	369
362	366	330	338
388	390	323	324

PRE	POST	PRE	POST
335	359	347	344
333	371	403	417
365	350	379	361
406	421	331	321
356	364	400	416
358	403	316	365
397	398	376	252
391	391	316	313
323	340	368	358
370	391	338	340
341	401	336	349
319	358	370	376
359	380	327	368
367	370	346	353
415	416	345	355
331	355	324	328
377	389	377	382
320	319	377	370
379	390	385	394
304	322	382	388
344	346	355	356
344	370	324	331
347	351	335	338
362	365	403	410

PRE	POST	PRE	POST
376	384	323	335
376	388	336	349
393	401	362	375
375	375	322	346
399	400	348	369
294	307	356	365
360	385	345	360
352	372	344	403
331	337	336	340
361	381		
349	326		
373	388		
364	367		
346	328		
329	341		
390	390		
317	278		
298	308		
298	300		
378	371		
393	400		
418	424		
379	389		
324	334		

PRE	POST
345	363
360	372
356	357
323	327
348	351
351	351
377	387

PRE	POST	PRE	POST
416	427	299	323
303	310	334	327
378	324	375	405
373	374	350	364
361	379	327	264
404	410	371	359
361	369	425	422
356	356	347	343
370	380	272	267
360	368	397	389
334	310	360	356
325	335	391	377
309	297	348	336
314	314	393	391
366	376	346	310
272	265	398	359
364	355	371	388
364	380	389	390
385	388	401	406
373	374	365	377
372	380	422	431
280	280	338	364
363	378	339	340
412	414	338	347

APPENDIX C

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ATTITUDE MEASURE

Phase I and II Participants

Education

Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$
51	50	52	53	52	-	43	43	43
46	48	50	42	43	44	39	41	41
44	43	43	48	49	-	40	41	-
49	50	51	53	53	-	41	45	47
49	50	-	47	47	50	37	37	41
48	48	52	47	47	47	47	50	50
48	48	48	47	47	-	49	50	53
51	51	-	53	53	-	54	53	55
51	52	-	49	42	42	47	44	-
53	53	-	49	47	50	40	35	43
52	52	53	44	36	40	52	49	-
44	48	50	46	48	49	50	49	-
46	53	-	51	50	-	53	53	57
37	45	40	49	52	52	38	39	39
49	49	48	48	52	52	45	47	49
40	39	39	51	53	54	45	45	-
53	53	55	45	46	46	51	52	52
50	51	51	43	52	-	35	41	53

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ATTITUDE MEASURE
(Continued)

Education

Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$
43	46	46	44	42	43	48	47	47
49	47	49	49	48	49	43	46	-
46	48	-	51	42	50	52	53	55
49	46	50	48	53	-	47	40	45
49	53	53	45	44	45	48	47	48
49	51	-	32	42	-	50	47	52
33	38	-	46	51	-	53	53	54
42	47	48	49	51	53	47	40	-
42	45	47	7	53	-	44	40	44
45	42	46	48	53	53	46	46	-
46	46	-	34	41	43	43	51	52
53	53	54	49	49	52	46	44	47
52	35	40	39	48	49	42	47	48
40	37	-	41	41	40	45	43	45
45	47	47	30	36	42	49	47	49
40	43	-	52	49	-	53	50	54
46	45	45	53	53	53	40	47	49
48	45	49	49	53	55	52	52	55
50	53	54	47	47	50	50	53	53

Education

Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$
44	49	49	47	41	-	47	50	51
53	49	-	39	38	41	48	45	-
48	49	51	51	52	53	13	50	-
38	39	-	43	53	-	53	53	54
48	47	50	53	53	53	38	43	45
50	51	53	48	53	55	47	51	51
52	51	53	51	51	53			
47	49	51	50	50	-			
42	46	47	52	50	-			
47	53	53	53	53	-			
48	49	52	50	48	-			
42	43	-	40	43	45			
42	47	-	44	53	-			
33	34	41	39	46	48			
46	50	52	53	53	53			
51	50	-	53	53	-			
47	47	-	41	52	-			
47	40	-	51	47	52			
45	53	-	47	50	51			
53	53	50	47	45	48			
41	43	40	48	51	-			

Education

Pre	Post	$Post_2$
46	50	-
42	27	-
43	45	47
53	53	54
40	41	-
53	48	-
48	47	48
53	51	-
30	37	-
53	49	-

School

Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	Post
37	39	41	39	40	41	50	51	52
4	40	41	45	48	45	49	51	-
42	42	42	41	50	-	50	51	-
41	50	48	42	48	-	53	53	-
38	37	39	47	40	-	52	52	54
47	51	54	42	43	-	46	47	48
49	49	51	53	46	54	49	53	-
53	55	51	34	41	-	21	33	36
48	51	-	48	48	-	50	48	52
35	35	39	53	46	55	42	35	49
44	45	-	35	36	-	46	49	52
53	40	53	53	47	-	51	48	52
41	43	48	46	50	-	42	46	48
43	45	48	50	50	52	47	50	51
43	46	-	52	51	-	50	53	-
52	50	53	30	33	-	35	40	-
42	42	-	45	49	51	21	28	32
53	53	55	43	47	49	47	45	-
36	38	41	47	48	46	48	49	-
38	53	51	44	51	48	35	47	49
49	48	51	38	37	-	44	49	-
46	48	-	43	44	46	53	53	-

School

Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$
49	52	53	46	48	-	52	49	53
47	47	49	53	52	54	35	45	47
45	46	-	46	47	49	49	42	49
53	53	-	30	34	-	53	53	-
50	51	53	44	39	47	39	40	43
41	34	43	46	48	-	50	48	-
49	49	49	43	40	47	7	52	54
52	51	-	50	44	52	48	56	51
46	53	56	51	52	52	47	43	49
45	48	-	43	47	49	46	41	-
46	53	52	52	49	-	41	44	45
47	46	48	48	49	51	48	45	49
52	51	-	39	38	-	43	53	-
48	43	49	44	47	50	52	53	55
53	48	53	42	49	50	50	53	54
47	49	51	43	47	48	49	47	-
44	53	-	44	51	53	45	45	47
52	53	54	40	49	48	40	50	51
48	49	-	41	41	-	46	52	54
46	44	-	47	47	-	53	38	-
48	46	48	53	48	55	49	49	50
45	44	49	50	53	55	50	48	-

School

Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$
43	53	-	53	53	-
42	46	48	37	52	-
38	43	48	49	53	-
44	44	47	49	37	51
43	50	53	45	49	51
50	49	51	39	41	43
44	47	48	43	49	-
49	47	47	47	46	-
50	50	53			
42	35	38			
44	45	-			
53	37	53			
47	45	49			
45	52	52			
50	48	51			
43	41	49			
51	53	-			
49	53	-			
13	47	-			
41	41	43			
50	53	-			
45	46	48			
49	48	49			

I (myself)

Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$
47	48	48	41	44	46	39	41	-
39	46	48	51	51	51	49	53	55
39	40	42	48	46	49	54	52	54
41	48	-	32	47	-	49	49	51
41	45	47	45	47	-	49	51	52
41	42	42	47	45	49	45	47	-
50	53	56	50	52	53	48	46	-
49	52	54	48	51	-	52	49	52
51	53	53	45	52	-	41	43	-
38	44	-	49	43	-	50	49	-
35	35	42	48	50	-	53	53	-
44	49	-	47	50	51	52	52	54
50	49	-	46	45	45	41	43	45
49	48	48	42	44	-	45	48	-
44	47	49	35	47	-	50	50	52
42	43	45	5	49	50	47	53	55
46	47	-	53	53	53	38	35	41
49	51	53	47	46	-	51	48	53
36	45	48	47	45	-	51	51	53
52	46	48	46	46	48	47	49	51
47	47	47	52	52	52	47	50	49
52	52	54	49	51	-	47	47	-

I (Myself)

Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$
51	47	-	48	43	48	47	53	53
45	46	48	44	46	48	43	46	48
41	45	-	49	53	-	49	52	53
49	45	-	52	52	52	43	46	49
44	46	48	48	48	-	44	41	44
48	49	-	46	46	-	42	47	49
53	53	-	43	47	47	49	50	52
47	47	49	46	43	46	43	53	53
47	47	49	53	40	53	48	47	49
47	49	-	52	52	-	39	46	48
53	53	-	43	45	46	43	47	48
50	41	53	51	0	51	51	48	-
52	50	53	46	45	-	46	46	49
46	49	49	48	49	51	44	47	-
50	53	55	40	46	49	45	47	51
52	51	-	52	49	53	51	51	56
49	49	50	51	48	51	31	36	38
44	48	49	45	46	48	47	41	-
46	51	52	44	49	50	52	50	53
48	51	54	49	50	52	53	53	53
44	45	-	46	46	-	47	52	52
45	45	49	39	46	49	45	49	51
43	44	45	49	48	-	50	50	51

I (Myself)

Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$
53	52	-	47	44	-
48	50	50	51	49	-
49	48	49	39	52	-
49	50	51	46	43	47
47	39	-	49	52	-
42	41	43	44	47	50
53	50	-	51	52	53
43	46	48	45	50	-
46	47	48	48	53	-
47	44	46	47	52	-
46	46	46	50	41	51
49	52	53	51	51	53
51	53	54	42	47	46
42	45	51	45	53	-
40	42	46	53	46	-
44	48	49			
45	50	51			
45	46	-			
53	53	54			
41	41	44			
45	47	49			
46	45	49			
46	45	47			

Most Other People

Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$
37	41	43	44	53	54	49	53	54
35	43	46	46	42	53	39	41	-
38	43	43	41	44	-	44	43	45
15	42	-	36	45	46	42	44	45
53	44	54	43	47	51	36	39	-
38	40	42	45	52	-	47	46	-
49	49	51	40	48	-	40	39	-
48	48	49	51	41	-	52	52	53
53	53	53	45	45	-	38	41	43
47	47	-	45	47	48	44	45	-
35	35	38	38	45	46	36	40	43
24	53	-	39	36	-	41	46	49
45	48	-	53	50	54	34	40	41
38	38	39	35	30	-	52	46	51
39	37	41	48	41	-	47	51	53
39	47	49	46	43	47	45	40	46
38	44	-	44	48	49	41	45	46
50	49	53	47	47	-	53	50	-
39	39	42	35	35	-	45	45	-
42	43	-	51	53	53	38	40	43
51	50	53	43	36	48	38	35	-
39	39	42	50	51	53	33	45	49

Most Other People

Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$
46	45	-	51	53	54	45	43	-
53	53	-	46	48	-	35	41	46
38	47	53	44	45	-	42	48	-
48	47	51	45	47	49	49	48	49
41	41	-	37	40	42	46	53	54
53	53	-	45	38	47	48	44	49
51	44	54	52	50	-	36	39	42
42	43	49	43	45	47	45	47	49
39	40	43	45	47	43	53	46	-
49	49	51	34	35	-	44	46	49
46	47	-	36	41	-	45	46	-
35	35	36	43	39	-	41	43	45
40	45	49	42	40	48	48	49	53
35	47	49	49	47	52	45	45	47
47	50	50	47	47	47	46	41	-
33	40	-	37	45	46	44	48	51
14	48	53	46	45	-	49	47	47
42	46	45	47	46	48	42	52	-
39	45	-	35	36	-	37	41	43
52	52	52	40	47	49	43	50	51
40	41	43	47	48	-	52	50	-
43	43	-	46	45	49	40	43	44

Most Other People

Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$
40	40	-	51	53	-
53	36	-	43	41	44
35	35	38	47	53	-
42	37	-	43	41	44
42	46	49	50	48	52
46	43	46	47	47	-
38	40	43	40	53	-
47	45	48	41	43	-
38	42	42	41	39	43
48	50	51	45	49	51
40	45	48	38	43	51
36	39	41	34	44	-
48	47	48	37	43	-
43	42	46			
39	46	-			
53	47	53			
38	44	46			
40	43	46			
50	45	52			
44	44	48			
48	42	-			
48	50	-			

People of Other Races

Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$
47	47	51	41	45	45	48	53	54
41	41	-	32	32	-	53	53	-
53	52	-	43	42	45	47	49	50
42	42	44	48	45	-	48	47	-
42	46	49	40	41	43	45	50	51
49	49	52	52	44	51	42	45	47
42	48	-	47	47	50	46	43	-
35	35	38	38	45	46	47	48	43
35	41	42	48	47	-	47	47	49
50	53	53	47	45	47	49	53	54
42	45	46	35	35	-	42	49	50
38	43	-	41	47	50	50	51	51
49	47	50	49	52	53	44	41	-
50	53	54	45	46	46	41	45	42
32	37	39	48	51	53	40	38	41
46	52	-	32	36	39	33	46	-
48	53	53	41	41	-	53	38	-
42	39	-	40	46	-	37	35	38
41	30	36	43	49	46	35	24	-
38	38	39	48	53	54	41	48	43
46	40	48	47	47	48	47	48	-
49	51	-	40	47	48	38	44	42

People of Other Races

Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$
37	41	42	47	45	46	36	44	-
43	45	48	49	53	-	44	50	-
36	35	39	34	53	-	53	53	-
48	49	49	48	37	-	52	53	53
49	49	53	53	50	-	38	43	50
53	53	53	49	44	52	53	53	-
50	49	-	40	46	48	40	40	44
31	35	40	42	43	-	35	36	41
51	49	-	41	40	42	35	35	39
40	36	43	34	35	-	49	48	49
34	35	40	50	42	-	47	50	52
39	47	48	37	38	39	49	48	50
46	44	-	48	50	51	44	49	51
51	53	53	42	42	-	53	55	-
34	36	39	35	35	-	41	44	-
42	43	-	44	47	48	39	40	42
51	52	53	42	40	43	38	35	-
33	40	43	45	52	50	48	46	-
40	48	50	51	53	55	37	43	39
42	53	45	39	43	-	47	47	-
45	45	-	44	43	45	53	53	-
40	43	40	42	42	45	47	45	46

People of Other Races

Pre	Post	$Post_2$	Pre	Post	$Post_2$
38	42	39	35	32	38
46	45	42	48	52	49
52	47	53	35	42	40
43	45	44	45	43	-
38	42	-	40	51	-
35	47	49			
40	38	-			
46	46	-			
53	43	52			
40	42	40			
42	49	50			
47	46	43			
35	35	37			
35	41	-			
45	53	-			
29	41	41			
50	51	-			
38	39	41			
49	49	47			
51	47	-			
40	52	-			
52	43	-			

APPENDIX D: EVALUATION OF PHASE II

INVOLVEMENT: PERSONAL

12. I felt involved in Phase I of CARES.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	2	2.7
Agree	(4)	35	47.3
Strongly Agree	(5)	37	50.0
Mean	= 4.473		
Standard Deviation	= .555		

21. I felt involved in Phase II of CARES.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	1	1.4
Agree	(4)	28	37.8
Strongly Agree	(5)	45	60.8
Mean	= 4.595		
Standard Deviation	= .521		

15. My involvement in CARES was appropriate.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	4	5.4
Agree	(4)	33	44.6
Strongly Agree	(5)	37	50.0
Mean	= 4.446		
Standard Deviation	= .600		

1. My involvement in CARES is important to me.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	0	0
Agree	(4)	25	33.8
Strongly Agree	(5)	49	66.2
Mean	= 4.662		
Standard Deviation	= .476		

18. My involvement in CARES was important to the project.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	1	1.4
Agree	(4)	48	64.9
Strongly Agree	(5)	25	33.8
Mean	= 4.324		
Standard Deviation	= .500		

22. My involvement in CARES was important to other people.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	10	13.5
Agree	(4)	42	56.8
Strongly Agree	(5)	22	29.7
Mean	= 4.162		
Standard Deviation	= .642		

39. My Phase II group made me feel very involved in the CARES process.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	1	1.4
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	1	1.4
Agree	(4)	33	44.6
Strongly Agree	(5)	39	52.7
Mean	= 4.486		
Standard Deviation	= .602		

INVOLVEMENT: OTHER

6. The supervisors' involvement in CARES was appropriate.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	2	2.7
Agree	(4)	15	20.3
Strongly Agree	(5)	57	77.0
Mean	= 4.743		
Standard Deviation	= .493		

27. The parents' involvement in CARES was appropriate.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	0	0
Agree	(4)	42	56.8
Strongly Agree	(5)	32	43.2
Mean	= 4.432		
Standard Deviation	= .499		

32. The students' involvement in CARES was appropriate.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	0	0
Agree	(4)	30	40.5
Strongly Agree	(5)	44	59.5
Mean	= 4.595		
Standard Deviation	= .494		

29. The involvement of the support personnel (school secretaries, lunchroom workers, maids, and janitors) in Phase I was appropriate.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	2	2.7
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	3	4.1
Agree	(4)	30	40.5
Strongly Agree	(5)	39	52.7
Mean	= 4.432		
Standard Deviation	= .704		

30. The participants in my Phase II group were equally as involved as I.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	6	8.1
Disagree	(2)	23	31.1
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	18	24.3
Agree	(4)	22	29.7
Strongly Agree	(5)	5	6.8
Mean	= 2.959		
Standard Deviation	= 1.103		

PARTICIPATION

40. I felt free to say exactly what I thought.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	2	2.7
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	4	5.4
Agree	(4)	30	40.5
Strongly Agree	(5)	38	51.4
Mean	= 4.405		
Standard Deviation	= .720		

25. I was expected to say exactly what I thought.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	1	1.4
Disagree	(2)	5	6.8
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	8	10.8
Agree	(4)	41	55.4
Strongly Agree	(5)	19	25.7
Mean	= 3.973		
Standard Deviation	= .875		

16. My suggestions were genuinely desired.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	8	10.8
Agree	(4)	37	50.0
Strongly Agree	(5)	29	39.2
Mean	= 4.284		
Standard Deviation	= .652		

33. My contributions were genuinely needed.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	19	25.7
Agree	(4)	40	54.1
Strongly Agree	(5)	15	20.3
Mean	= 3.946		
Standard Deviation	= .680		

2. I contributed to the project.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	0	0
Agree	(4)	39	52.7
Strongly Agree	(5)	35	47.3
Mean	= 4.473		
Standard Deviation	= .503		

4. My ideas were always given a hearing.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	1	1.4
Disagree	(2)	8	10.8
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	3	4.1
Agree	(4)	38	51.4
Strongly Agree	(5)	24	32.4
Mean = 4.027			
Standard Deviation = .965			

17. In my Phase II group, we participated openly.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	1	1.4
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	1	1.4
Agree	(4)	21	28.4
Strongly Agree	(5)	51	68.9
Mean = 4.649			
Standard Deviation = .584			

28. In my Phase II group, we participated freely.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	1	1.4
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	1	1.4
Agree	(4)	29	39.2
Strongly Agree	(5)	43	58.1
Mean = 4.541			
Standard Deviation = .601			

COMMUNICATION

5. I could communicate with people "like me" in the project.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	1	1.4
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	0	0
Agree	(4)	39	52.7
Strongly Agree	(5)	34	45.9
Mean = 4.432			
Standard Deviation = .575			

14. I could communicate with people "different from me" in the project.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	1	1.4
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	1	1.4
Agree	(4)	38	51.4
Strongly Agree	(5)	34	45.9
Mean	= 4.419		
Standard Deviation	= .597		

9. I could communicate with the supervisor in my group.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	1	1.4
Agree	(4)	18	24.3
Strongly Agree	(5)	55	74.3
Mean	= 4.730		
Standard Deviation	= .477		

26. I could communicate with the CARES leadership staff.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	1	1.4
Agree	(4)	34	45.9
Strongly Agree	(5)	39	52.7
Mean	= 4.514		
Standard Deviation	= .530		

11. I could not communicate with everybody in the project.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	20	27.0
Disagree	(2)	37	50.0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	6	8.1
Agree	(4)	11	14.9
Strongly Agree	(5)	0	0
Mean	= 2.108		
Standard Deviation	= .973		

38. Participants were involved in decisions of importance to the project.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	0	0
Agree	(4)	49	66.2
Strongly Agree	(5)	25	33.8
Mean	= 4.338		
Standard Deviation	= .476		

7. The degree to which I was involved in CARES was a function of circumstances.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	6	8.1
Disagree	(2)	40	54.1
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	15	20.3
Agree	(4)	13	17.6
Strongly Agree	(5)	0	0
Mean	= 2.473		
Standard Deviation	= .879		

10. The degree to which I was involved in CARES was my choice.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	2	2.7
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	3	4.1
Agree	(4)	39	52.7
Strongly Agree	(5)	30	40.5
Mean	= 4.311		
Standard Deviation	= .681		

24. I would have preferred having experts develop the teaching models over the process used in CARES.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	26	35.1
Disagree	(2)	38	51.4
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	8	10.8
Agree	(4)	1	1.4
Strongly Agree	(5)	1	1.4
Mean	= 1.824		
Standard Deviation	= .783		

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

37. There were no set expectations for the project.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	8	10.8
Disagree	(2)	43	58.1
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	8	10.8
Agree	(4)	9	12.2
Strongly Agree	(5)	6	8.1
Mean	= 2.486		
Standard Deviation	= 1.101		

3. Leadership personnel were honest about wanting the involvement of participants.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	1	1.4
Agree	(4)	22	29.7
Strongly Agree	(5)	51	68.9
Mean	= 4.676		
Standard Deviation	= .500		

20. I feel that the CARES staff (leadership people) really believe in the concept of the project.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	1	1.4
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	0	0
Agree	(4)	22	29.7
Strongly Agree	(5)	51	68.9
Mean	= 4.662		
Standard Deviation	= .556		

GROWTH AND COMMITMENT

19. I CARE more about the objectives of the project after our work together.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	1	1.4
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	1	1.4
Agree	(4)	31	41.9
Strongly Agree	(5)	5	55.4
Mean	= 4.514		
Standard Deviation	= .602		

23. My attitude toward the CARES concept is more positive than ever.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	1	1.4
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	1	1.4
Agree	(4)	38	51.4
Strongly Agree	(5)	34	45.9
Mean	= 4.419		
Standard Deviation	= .597		

13. I am committed to the purpose of the CARES project.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	2	2.7
Agree	(4)	32	43.2
Strongly Agree	(5)	40	54.1
Mean	= 4.514		
Standard Deviation	= .555		

34. Being aware of cultural differences is more important to me since CARES.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	3	4.1
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	1	1.4
Agree	(4)	40	54.1
Strongly Agree	(5)	30	40.5
Mean	= 4.311		
Standard Deviation	= .701		

31. I feel committed to an ethnic-oriented curriculum, at least partly because I share the CARES concept.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	1	1.4
Agree	(4)	48	64.9
Strongly Agree	(5)	25	33.8
Mean	= 4.324		
Standard Deviation	= .500		

36. The teaching models approach to curriculum development used in CARES will provide appropriate suggestions for implementation of ideas growing out of the project.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	2	2.7
Agree	(4)	42	56.8
Strongly Agree	(5)	30	40.5
Mean	= 4.378		
Standard Deviation	= 0.542		

35. My teaching methods will be more flexible as a result of CARES.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	0	0
Agree	(4)	39	52.7
Strongly Agree	(5)	34	45.9
Mean	= 4.405		
Standard Deviation	= .702		

41. I feel a sense of responsibility for assuming my part in the implementation of the CARES concept in my classroom in 1974-75.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	0	0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	1	1.4
Agree	(4)	25	33.8
Strongly Agree	(5)	48	64.9
Mean	= 4.635		
Standard Deviation	= .512		

8. I will assume some responsibility for the implementation of the CARES concept at my school in 1974-75.

		f	%
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0
Disagree	(2)	1	1.4
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	(3)	0	0
Agree	(4)	29	39.2
Strongly Agree	(5)	44	59.5
Mean	= 4.568		
Standard Deviation	= .575		

APPENDIX E

RELIABILITY

ANALYSIS OF RATINGS OF CARES MODELS

$Ex^2 = 111.31$

	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3	Rater 4	Rater 5	Rater 6	Rater 7	Sum	Sum^2
Social Studies	1.67	2	1	1.33	1	1.75	1	9.75	95.06
Music and Art	2.33	3	2	3	1	3	2	16.33	266.67
Language Arts II	1.33	2	1	1	1.33	1.33	1	8.99	80.82
Language Arts I	2.67	1	1	1	1	2	2	9.67	93.51
Science	1.67	1	1	1	1	1.5	2.33	9.5	90.25
Mathematics	1.67	1	1.33	1	1	1	1.67	8.67	75.17
Sum	11.34	10	7.33	8.33	6.33	10.58	10	63.91	701.48
Sum^2	128.60	100	53.73	69.39	40.07	111.94	100	642.33	

Sum of Squared Ratings = 111.31

Product of sums and mean $63.91 \times \frac{63.91}{42}$ + 97.143

Sum of Squares

For Raters	$\frac{642.33}{6} - 97.143$	= 9.912
For Models	$\frac{701.48}{7} - 97.143$	= 3.068
For Total	$111.31 - 97.143$	= 14.167
For Error	$14.167 - 3.068 - 9.912$	= 1.187

Mean Square

For Models	$3.068 \div 5$	= .6136
For Error	$1.187 \div 36$	= .0329
Reliability of Ratings	$\frac{.6136 - .0329}{.6136 + (7-1)\ .0329}$	= .716
Reliability of Average Ratings	$\frac{.6136 - .0329}{.6136}$	= .946

APPENDIX F

MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY (MTAI)

Phase II Participants

Pre	Post	Pre	Post
30	61	-46	-19
48	45	-10	56
30	-16	41	47
32	27	-50	30
62	89	15	60
-35	-59	-14	26
25	75	-02	15
14	32	75	85
39	60	69	75
33	28	-26	-27
80	84	13	46
-20	-9	0	41
16	14	30	-16
42	35	62	89
55	63	9	55
40	63	93	72
-24	-48	82	84
-15	5	82	85
40	57	15	24
34	87		
06	04		
65	68		

APPENDIX G

ILLUSTRATIVE STATEMENTS OF
NATURAL HISTORY OBSERVATION DATA

CARES TEACHER

Three black males sitting in the back of the room. White group dominant, but teacher deliberately involves blacks, and some of the peer interaction occurs across racial lines. Blacks do initiate themselves at times.

Social control: spontaneous interaction, voluntary response, almost any initiation pattern accepted to a "point." When noise level gets too much, teacher says, "hush." Easy, unthreatened reaction to her suggestion.

Second group immediately more involved in class discussion. Teacher shifts the discussion to black male group. Then two groups dominate the discussion. She switches back and forth from the two groups to other students in the class. Halfway through the discussion, she switches the discussion to white male and female groups.

Great deal of personalized interaction but was directed to the topic of discussion. Draws out students who seem somewhat reluctant to participate.

NON-CARES TEACHER

Student reports. Teacher and one student rate reports. Students read from notes; include dates, state facts. They play another "game" of getting the right answers, fill in the blank. Stress on one question coming from the teacher and one "right" answer coming from the student.

Teacher holds "recitation" which leads to "right" answers. Her right answers have to be a bit more complex to satisfy her than the right answers given to the student teacher.

Lengthy teacher dissertation on the greatness of Truman as a president, the "rightness" of the Hiroshima bomb decision, its being the only logical choice.

NON-CARES TEACHER (continued)

Teacher says: "If you like,of course, in a very ladylike manner." "You may say hot dog in a gentlemanly fashion."

SUMMARY
Reciprocal Category System
Observation Data

	CARES SAMPLE	NON-CARES SAMPLE
Teacher-Pupil Ratio	2/1	3.5/1
Student Flexibility	13 of 18	7 of 18
Teacher Flexibility	10 of 18	5 of 18
General Flexibility	12 of 18	7 of 18
Student Initiation	11 of 18	3 of 18
Divergent Student Responses	16 of 18	9 of 18

APPENDIX H

EDUCATION

CARES				NON-CARES			
Pre		Post		Pre		Post	
Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
33.067	5.595	31.962	3.736	37.048	4.685	32.966	4.996
35.080	5.204	33.000	4.419	31.655	4.064	32.053	6.114
34.300	5.621	32.762	6.759	31.824	7.222	34.364	4.403
29.929	10.558	33.250	4.857	30.429	5.801	30.550	5.266
34.684	6.000	31.308	4.790	32.714	4.868	34.125	8.077
35.917	5.437	35.682	5.685	34.533	5.975	32.150	5.470
32.391	4.580	36.571	5.095	33.040	5.216	33.500	6.897
31.810	5.066	30.583	7.956	32.966	4.910	32.333	6.362
33.393	5.280	35.185	4.368	32.750	3.884	32.840	6.060
34.833	3.959	33.263	4.942	32.034	6.801	34.348	5.734
33.607	5.814	29.552	7.637	33.958	6.140	32.500	5.454
34.926	5.540	34.045	7.556	31.862	8.919	33.269	5.227
34.115	4.555	33.692	4.798	32.464	5.419	31.095	7.416
31.625	5.097	27.167	11.374	32.524	4.479	32.765	4.944
36.556	4.585	36.417	5.021	32.632	6.379	35.385	4.646
35.032	4.950	32.867	5.746	33.370	8.025	36.043	3.971
34.765	4.617	33.100	6.719	35.267	7.995	35.172	6.804
31.609	6.686	32.760	4.841	36.333	5.484	36.276	5.625
30.720	6.248	31.517	6.706	31.615	6.463	32.609	8.095
38.607	4.841	33.913	8.409	33.640	6.277	31.593	8.386
37.824	3.762	35.654	5.796	35.037	7.003	34.435	5.542
36.828	5.332	34.813	5.256	33.733	6.782	31.704	12.152
38.077	4.542	38.552	2.733	31.313	6.964	33.250	11.647
36.036	5.217	33.867	4.644	35.000	7.787	36.310	8.718
36.793	5.421	36.000	5.864	36.815	6.811	35.154	6.932
34.167	4.842	35.130	5.405	38.300	4.843	36.067	5.644
				37.643	5.237	34.714	6.687
				35.500	5.722	36.300	4.868

SCHOOL

CARES				NON-CARES			
Pre		Post		Pre		Post	
Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
30.867	6.506	29.192	5.052	35.524	6.361	30.483	6.679
34.880	6.502	32.889	5.697	30.414	5.735	24.842	9.400
32.533	9.424	32.381	5.723	30.353	9.117	32.591	6.100
29.071	11.731	32.708	6.054	30.381	6.461	27.700	9.056
35.263	6.035	30.077	8.993	33.464	5.897	30.667	9.531
35.458	5.150	34.045	8.952	27.867	15.955	30.300	6.650
33.652	4.677	34.238	6.347	30.480	6.152	31.000	10.317
30.905	7.293	29.542	9.798	32.379	5.653	31.667	9.267
33.214	5.698	33.556	5.918	31.750	9.029	30.320	7.426
30.778	9.207	32.737	4.689	29.483	9.869	32.000	7.669
31.750	10.028	24.931	10.673	33.833	6.105	32.429	8.500
31.148	10.242	24.182	15.230	29.724	11.554	30.577	5.405
33.731	5.318	32.308	5.958	32.107	6.951	26.714	10.840
27.208	10.962	24.792	11.291	31.667	5.508	30.353	6.304
37.222	3.846	37.000	4.304	32.053	6.416	34.692	5.907
33.161	8.279	30.800	7.420	31.778	6.722	34.652	4.638
34.765	4.521	29.200	10.866	34.833	6.859	33.897	8.217
30.174	10.786	29.680	10.459	35.148	7.779	35.138	6.518
29.320	8.778	27.586	10.966	30.192	10.143	28.304	14.433
37.250	5.707	33.652	11.547	28.640	9.891	27.407	11.450
36.471	5.501	33.423	10.222	33.296	7.584	30.304	7.678
34.000	9.266	31.688	6.226	26.400	13.520	25.259	15.506
37.808	5.886	37.655	5.413	28.063	7.416	26.583	13.899
35.929	5.938	33.600	6.896	35.690	9.921	36.483	8.056
25.000	16.531	33.667	8.749	33.741	12.620	31.808	9.500
34.500	6.481	33.826	5.314	35.200	8.070	30.733	11.191
				37.821	5.907	34.619	7.921
				33.577	5.186	36.400	5.286

I (MYSELF)

CARES				NON-CARES			
Pre		Post		Pre		Post	
Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
34.933	6.175	32.538	5.694	37.476	5.056	34.517	4.453
35.800	5.701	36.722	3.375	34.828	4.796	36.053	4.378
37.167	4.921	36.095	4.206	35.824	4.081	37.636	4.665
34.250	9.143	35.833	3.726	33.905	7.210	33.000	5.722
35.737	7.702	34.923	4.656	35.357	3.918	36.167	6.357
35.000	4.625	38.273	4.085	33.533	5.792	32.750	5.260
33.391	4.560	38.476	4.423	35.200	5.331	35.625	6.486
35.524	2.977	35.292	5.409	30.655	5.996	33.222	7.199
37.536	3.616	35.407	5.351	35.429	4.086	35.320	5.194
35.944	3.977	35.632	5.580	31.828	5.575	36.478	5.575
36.393	4.533	33.793	6.073	36.417	5.141	37.250	3.607
36.000	4.907	35.136	7.318	32.276	9.830	34.577	5.390
35.808	4.070	36.346	3.532	35.929	5.326	34.476	7.705
33.958	5.967	29.750	12.134	35.952	4.353	34.882	4.196
37.407	4.326	39.792	2.670	34.632	4.991	37.462	3.455
34.742	6.424	34.933	5.825	34.074	6.427	36.130	5.463
36.118	3.982	36.500	5.898	37.100	5.202	37.310	5.373
32.696	6.918	33.600	5.605	37.481	4.484	38.241	5.118
34.960	4.928	34.103	5.857	33.231	6.389	35.478	6.438
36.357	6.032	36.043	6.519	34.520	6.545	33.852	6.255
36.588	5.455	35.615	5.783	35.741	7.273	36.826	4.407
35.897	5.765	32.688	6.161	36.067	5.831	34.296	8.118
36.423	7.284	35.483	5.540	34.000	5.416	31.333	12.331
36.286	6.030	36.900	4.773	34.103	8.432	37.655	7.570
34.034	6.962	35.000	6.409	35.852	6.274	33.731	7.702
36.167	5.821	34.870	6.758	37.767	5.110	35.733	5.848
				31.286	10.136	34.905	6.670
				32.038	5.639	33.150	6.540

MOST OTHER PEOPLE

CARES				NON-CARES			
Pre		Post		Pre		Post	
Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
30.633	5.461	30.115	5.743	27.190	10.610	29.897	6.184
35.360	5.131	32.722	5.592	30.034	4.602	29.579	8.181
33.833	5.914	30.762	7.092	26.706	7.975	31.000	5.563
33.429	9.582	31.375	5.232	27.619	7.619	28.050	5.790
33.579	7.042	30.654	6.705	30.179	5.670	29.250	6.595
29.625	6.704	29.273	8.531	30.333	8.649	26.550	6.637
32.043	4.800	34.048	7.096	28.360	4.966	29.375	8.010
30.667	4.983	28.708	9.937	30.345	5.184	29.889	6.825
30.536	7.141	33.556	4.790	30.250	7.121	31.040	6.931
31.556	6.317	32.947	5.338	31.517	6.317	31.000	8.118
30.179	7.770	27.862	8.975	31.667	7.597	30.786	5.808
31.704	6.503	27.955	7.901	29.172	9.091	28.192	5.177
31.962	5.016	33.885	5.743	30.143	6.742	30.476	6.439
30.750	7.042	27.750	12.252	31.476	4.273	32.000	4.153
33.630	6.039	28.833	10.222	31.579	6.939	34.462	5.825
32.613	7.826	30.633	7.209	31.000	8.918	31.130	7.876
32.000	6.062	31.250	4.962	30.267	9.662	28.586	8.777
32.957	6.759	28.040	6.693	33.333	7.406	31.552	7.595
28.600	6.403	29.897	7.331	30.769	6.970	31.391	10.535
27.107	10.966	30.174	10.748	33.280	7.413	30.074	8.278
30.529	7.843	31.423	6.243	33.889	6.021	31.696	7.080
29.000	7.635	26.125	4.856	30.367	7.586	27.620	12.055
35.923	5.824	31.310	8.574	29.188	4.847	29.750	11.371
31.429	8.817	31.800	7.369	32.793	9.586	30.138	9.322
32.138	6.765	31.963	7.470	27.963	10.025	25.346	10.056
30.333	7.654	27.696	7.151	32.400	9.276	29.100	7.102
				29.286	9.706	30.333	7.303
				27.962	6.309	29.450	7.776

PEOPLE OF OTHER RACES

CARES				NON-CARES			
Pre		Post		Pre		Post	
Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
29.800	6.277	29.192	6.615	29.000	3.849	29.069	6.984
31.800	7.550	31.278	6.027	28.621	6.372	30.632	8.552
28.433	10.224	33.810	4.792	30.765	7.628	32.909	5.999
30.036	9.762	29.417	8.256	30.048	5.903	27.750	8.309
30.474	7.705	30.077	7.985	30.214	7.505	31.333	8.570
31.708	9.276	32.182	6.850	23.400	13.871	26.100	6.711
32.304	5.448	35.095	5.974	29.040	7.602	28.208	9.184
29.667	6.726	27.375	8.904	29.759	8.127	28.278	8.505
33.071	5.894	33.444	5.807	30.464	9.236	30.800	7.228
30.444	6.972	29.526	9.186	28.138	8.794	28.739	8.389
33.036	8.694	25.759	9.959	32.583	9.329	29.857	9.497
28.296	10.520	20.909	13.673	26.414	10.649	28.923	6.039
30.808	6.905	29.731	8.345	28.714	6.491	28.476	8.618
29.083	8.895	27.167	12.285	31.381	6.265	31.588	6.145
31.926	6.983	29.375	9.226	31.316	7.134	35.769	5.262
31.032	10.144	30.700	9.248	29.889	8.382	31.087	7.006
31.647	6.204	29.900	10.997	33.033	7.854	30.552	8.003
29.174	10.684	27.800	9.014	32.333	9.055	32.517	7.119
26.360	8.529	24.414	8.938	27.577	8.528	25.565	14.777
33.036	8.430	30.609	11.762	28.360	11.434	27.259	9.606
31.824	6.356	30.385	10.092	30.259	8.098	29.609	7.638
28.793	10.811	29.813	6.988	25.800	11.897	24.259	13.134
35.231	8.701	31.414	6.115	28.313	6.897	26.167	11.877
35.643	5.970	31.667	7.443	33.069	9.640	33.414	9.466
23.517	16.339	30.889	9.512	28.630	10.411	27.846	9.511
31.875	7.444	29.913	6.762	31.867	11.295	28.633	10.522
				25.750	10.892	32.619	6.874
				28.769	5.399	33.550	5.520

DIFFERENCE SCORES

EDUCATION		SCHOOL	
CARES	NON-CARES	CARES	NON-CARES
-1.105	-4.082	-1.675	-5.041
-2.08	+ .398	-1.991	-5.572
-1.538	+2.54	- .152	+2.238
+3.321	+ .121	+3.637	-2.681
-3.376	+1.411	-5.186	-2.797
- .235	-2.383	-1.413	+2.433
+4.18	+ .46	+ .586	+ .52
-1.227	- .633	-1.363	- .712
+1.792	+ .09	+ .342	-1.43
-1.57	+2.314	+1.959	+2.517
-4.055	-1.458	-6.819	-1.404
- .881	+1.407	-6.966	+ .853
[illegible]423	-1.369	- .423	-5.393
-4[illegible].8	+ .241	-2.416	-1.314
- .139	+2.753	- .222	+2.639
-2.165	+2.673	-2.361	+2.874
-1.665	- .095	-5.565	- .936
+1.151	- .057	- .494	- .01
+ .797	+ .994	-1.734	-1.888
-4.694	-2.047	-3.598	-1.233
-2.17	- .602	-3.048	-2.992
-2.015	-2.029	-2.312	-1.141

EDUCATION		SCHOOL	
CARES	NON-CARES	CARES	NON-CARES
+ .475	+1.937	- .253	-1.48
-2.169	+1.31	-2.329	+ .793
- .793	-1.661	+8.667	-1.933
+ .963	-2.233	- .674	-4.467
	-2.929		-3.202
	+ .800		+2.823

MYSELF		MOST OTHER PEOPLE	
-2.395	2.959	- .518	+2.707
+ .922	+1.225	-2.638	- .455
-1.072	+1.812	-3.071	+4.294
+1.583	.905	-2.054	+ .431
- .814	+ .81	-2.925	- .929
+3.273	.783	- .352	-3.783
+5.085	+ .425	+2.005	+1.015
- .232	+2.567	-1.959	- .456
-2.129	.109	+3.02	- .21
- .312	+4.65	+1.391	- .517
-2.6	+ .833	-2.317	- .881
- .864	+2.301	-3.749	- .98
+ .538	1.453	+1.923	+ .333
-4.208	1.07	-3.00	+ .524
+2.388	+2.83	-4.797	+2.883
- .191	+2.056	-1.98	+ .13

MYSELF		MOST OTHER PEOPLE	
CARES	NON-CARES	CARES	NON-CARES
+ .382	+ .21	- .75	-1.681
+ .904	+ .76	-4.917	-1.781
- .857	+2.247	+1.297	+ .622
- .314	.668	+3.067	-3.206
- .973	+1.085	+ .894	-2.193
-3.209	1.771	-2.875	-2.737
- .94	2.667	-4.613	+ .562
+ .614	+3.552	+ .371	-2.655
+ .966	2.121	- .175	-2.617
-1.297	2.034	-2.637	-3.3
	+3.619		+1.047
	+1.112		+1.488

PEOPLE OF OTHER RACES	
- .608	- .069
- .522	+2.011
+5.377	+2.144
- .619	-2.298
- .397	+1.119
+ .474	+2.7
+2.791	- .832
-2.292	-1.481
+ .373	+ .336
- .918	+ .601

PEOPLE OF OTHER RACES

CARES	NON-CARES
-7.277	-2.726
-7.387	+2.509
-1.077	- .238
-1.916	+ .207
-2.551	+4.453
- .332	+1.198
-1.747	-2.481
-1.374	+ .184
-1.946	-2.012
-2.427	-1.101
-1.439	-1.65
+1.02	-1.541
-3.817	-2.146
-3.976	+ .345
+7.372	- .784
-1.962	-3.234
	+6.869
	+4.781

APPENDIX I: STUDENT SELF CONCEPT DATA

SELF APPRAISAL

CARES				NON-CARES			
Pre		Post		Pre		Post	
Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
14.428	2.167	13.714	2.746	13.666	2.681	14.793	2.257
14.407	2.899	14.136	2.455	14.655	3.497	14.714	3.547
14.185	2.774	14.074	2.495	14.928	2.879	15.363	1.865
15.041	2.926	13.500	5.786	14.523	2.159	13.588	1.121
15.185	2.542	15.458	3.134	14.684	2.001	14.384	2.256
15.633	2.470	16.344	3.308	15.592	3.825	15.250	2.591
16.705	2.800	14.904	2.467	15.100	2.783	14.466	2.096
15.478	2.371	15.680	2.393	15.500	3.203	14.551	2.626
15.360	2.736	14.600	2.633	14.551	3.134	18.200	4.173
14.500	2.795	16.769	3.063	13.740	2.535	13.680	2.749
16.588	3 183	14.888	2.224	15.107	3.071	15.043	3.759
15.655	2.894	15.250	3.356	16.466	2.788	15.777	2.900
15.259	2.668	15.286	2.758	15.235	2.359	15.909	2.809
15.000	3.067	15.103	2.781	16.482	3.280	16.413	2.657
15.973	3.028	15.533	2.192	16.333	2.496	15.307	3.781
				14.733	2.740	15.933	2.839
				14.642	2.705	15.200	2.915
				16.826	2.870	16.400	2.683

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT

CARES				NON-CARES			
Pre		Post		Pre		Post	
Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
310.795	38.197	327.783	55.144	320.232	36.249	319.832	35.765
309.802	32.190	296.185	30.913	321.215	40.310	320.056	36.491
315.134	34.591	310.795	36.855	319.098	40.354	319.846	40.660
314.685	35.453	318.618	35.515	311.533	48.615	318.846	40.156
316.603	53.886	315.871	36.144	312.130	47.286	311.829	47.966
318.941	36.151	318.117	36.237	333.397	34.397	333.646	32.496
319.728	36.958	325.448	33.144	333.282	35.165	332.581	35.475
325.617	39.180	324.473	36.838	333.406	36.238	333.746	35.360
328.402	38.416	325.842	38.892	329.235	56.012	331.905	37.459
331.021	38.289	331.409	40.397				
334.894	31.933	334.756	33.433				

DIFFERENCE SCORES

TENNESSEE SELF-CONCEPT		SELF-APPRAISAL	
CARES	NON-CARES	CARES	NON-CARES
+16.988	- .400	- .714	+1.127
-13.617	-1.159	- .271	+0.059
- 4.339	+0.748	- .111	+0.435
+ 3.933	+7.313	-1.541	-0.935
- .732	-0.301	+0.273	-0.300
- .874	+0.249	+0.711	-0.342
+ 5.720	- .701	-1.801	-0.634
- 1.114	+ .340	+0.202	-0.949
- 2.56	+2.670	-0.760	+3.649
+ 0.388		+2.269	-0.060
- 0.138		-1.700	-0.064
		-0.405	-0.689
		+0.027	+0.674
		+0.103	-0.069
		-0.440	-1.026
			+1.200
			+0.558
			-0.426

APPENDIX J: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT TEST DATA

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Fourth Grade Data

Obtained Grade Placement

READING			MATH		
Cares	Non-Cares	Control	Cares	Non-Cares	Control
3.0	2.1	3.2	4.0	2.8	2.1
2.2	3.0	5.8	2.9	3.7	4.2
6.4	4.5	4.7	6.0	3.4	4.6
2.9	2.3	0.6	2.3	4.2	0.6
3.2	2.5	4.8	2.4	3.5	3.9
5.0	2.1	3.3	5.2	3.8	0.6
5.0	0.9	6.0	4.8	2.3	5.9
7.9	1.8	3.9	4.8	3.9	3.5
4.8	1.7	3.9	4.9	1.4	3.9
4.1	4.6	4.9	4.6	5.6	5.1
6.3	0.9	6.6	5.9	4.3	5.4
8.8	3.7	3.9	5.3	3.4	4.5
2.0	1.8	0.6	3.4	3.1	0.6
6.0	2.2	2.3	5.4	3.0	1.9
5.0	2.1	5.8	4.8	2.3	5.5
2.7	1.6	5.4	3.3	3.3	4.0
2.6	3.7	5.0	2.8	3.3	4.4
2.3	2.1	4.2	3.4	2.1	4.4
3.8	2.7	5.4	4.1	3.1	5.2
5.1	2.0	5.6	4.0	1.8	5.5

READING			MATH		
Cares	Non-Cares	Control	Cares	Non-Cares	Control
4.9	2.9	3.7	5.1	4.1	5.1
4.0	2.1	8.8	3.0	3.0	6.5
4.0	3.1	1.7	5.2	3.4	2.5
4.1	4.0	4.7	4.0	4.3	3.7
7.5	1.6	3.6	4.7	1.3	5.6
4.5	3.0	4.9	5.0	4.0	3.4
2.6	2.2	4.8	3.4	3.5	3.8
7.7	5.0	5.7	5.7	4.4	3.4
8.8	2.1	8.5	5.0	2.3	6.4
3.2	4.5	4.5	3.2	4.8	4.2
5.1	2.5	2.7	4.5	2.8	3.7
3.1	5.1	3.2	3.0	4.5	4.8
5.1	1.6	4.5	4.5	2.5	4.5
6.8	1.4	6.3	6.1	2.2	4.4
5.6	1.7	5.3	5.9	3.0	5.2
5.0	3.3	3.3	5.2	4.8	2.7
6.0	4.4	7.4	5.4	3.5	6.3
6.8	3.4	5.1	6.6	3.6	4.8
6.0	2.2	7.1	4.6	3.0	4.4
7.0	3.2	4.0	5.8	4.2	4.3
0.7	2.4	3.3	2.3	2.5	4.3
5.7	3.1	8.5	2.6	3.2	6.7
2.6	2.4	9.8	2.5	0.6	5.4

READING			MATH		
Cares	Non-Cares	Control	Cares	Non-Cares	Control
5.0	1.8	5.2	5.7	3.3	5.3
2.0	0.6	4.5	3.4	0.6	4.6
5.2	3.1	2.4	5.0	0.6	3.4
5.1	1.4	3.9	4.4	2.8	5.0
4.2	4.7	5.1	4.8	4.9	4.8
3.3	1.1	2.4	3.4	2.7	3.1
1.6	2.3	5.0	2.6	2.4	4.2
2.2	0.6	4.9	2.1	1.3	5.2
2.3	0.6	4.0	4.2	2.8	4.0
2.7	0.6	4.1	3.9	0.6	5.0
5.0	0.7	3.6	4.2	0.6	4.2
6.4	1.8	4.2	4.4	2.8	3.4

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Tenth Grade Data

Obtained Grade Placement

READING			MATH		
Cares	Non-Cares	Control	Cares	Non-Cares	Control
12.7	9.2	6.2	10.2	9.5	6.7
12.9	4.1	6.8	12.9	0.6	6.3
7.6	6.5	5.5	6.1	7.3	5.4
13.5	13.6	10.5	13.1	13.6	10.2
5.3	11.9	10.1	5.5	8.7	7.2
9.5	9.9	4.3	9.2	8.3	4.7
8.6	10.9	4.9	7.2	12.4	4.9
5.9	4.9	4.6	7.7	5.4	9.0
7.0	6.8	8.5	7.8	5.2	7.8
12.2	8.2	8.6	9.7	9.8	7.8
9.9	11.2	0.6	9.8	12.0	8.6
7.6	8.5	10.1	7.2	8.4	0.6
11.2	7.4	4.1	10.6	7.0	6.8
5.5	12.2	11.0	6.7	10.9	3.3
9.1	11.4	10.1	6.4	11.6	8.9
6.5	7.8	4.9	7.1	6.1	10.0
10.1	10.9	8.0	8.6	10.9	9.5
7.4	11.9	0.6	6.8	13.6	10.2
10.2	8.0	8.2	10.5	9.7	0.6
7.4	6.2	5.3	9.0	6.6	8.4

READING			MATH		
Cares	Non-Cares	Control	Cares	Non-Cares	Control
13.5	9.2	10.2	9.5	7.6	6.4
7.0	11.9	9.1	6.0	13.6	10.1
9.9	3.8	5.1	9.8	5.5	8.3
8.2	0.6	4.3	13.5	0.6	7.6
10.4	5.9	7.4	10.1	5.5	3.7
10.5	8.6	6.8	9.8	8.9	8.5
11.0	0.6	5.9	7.3	9.8	6.1
5.9	10.5	5.9	5.4	9.2	4.9
5.9	5.9	3.3	8.5	5.1	8.6
8.5	8.6	5.9	0.6	7.8	5.4
7.8	4.1	4.9	9.5	6.0	5.8
11.6	6.5	7.8	13.6	7.2	4.6
5.9	10.2	5.1	6.7	7.7	13.6
11.9	12.7	0.6	10.5	13.6	4.7
10.4	13.3	6.2	13.6	13.3	0.6
10.4	5.3	3.8	12.9	6.7	6.7
10.9	7.8	4.6	13.3	7.4	5.8
5.9	3.8	9.7	8.5	5.5	4.4
7.6	9.8	8.0	5.8	5.8	7.8
2.8	8.0	4.1	5.2	7.1	7.9
10.2	6.5	6.2	8.0	9.2	4.7
5.1	5.9	7.8	6.3	5.2	0.6
10.4	9.8	8.0	13.6	6.7	8.9

READING			MATH		
Cares	Non-Cares	Control	Cares	Non-Cares	Control
7.8	9.7	7.8	8.4	7.3	8.6
11.6	10.4	8.0	12.7	8.3	3.9
8.6	5.3	8.0	7.7	4.9	6.8
12.7	12.2	10.1	13.5	12.4	6.1
9.9	10.1	12.9	4.2	9.4	7.4
10.1	7.8	10.1	9.7	6.6	13.3
7.4	4.9	7.0	7.8	7.9	10.1
13.6	13.6	13.6	10.1	13.6	7.6
.6	7.2	11.9	9.1	0.6	10.9
13.2	4.9	13.3	9.1	6.3	10.1
12.9	9.8	13.6	13.6	6.8	13.6
9.5	5.9	6.8	7.0	5.8	13.6
10.5	3.0	13.6	8.5	2.6	0.6
11.2	11.2	5.1	10.2	9.3	10.2
13.6	9.9	8.6	12.9	8.7	6.0
7.8	8.6	5.3	8.6	8.2	5.5
7.8	7.4	11.0	7.7	6.1	5.1
10.4	4.6	13.5	6.7	3.3	11.4
11.9	9.1	13.3	11.6	8.9	13.6
5.1	6.2	4.0	5.7	3.5	9.2
8.0	7.6	10.9	7.3	7.6	0.6
8.6	13.6	10.2	9.2	13.6	8.7
13.6	13.6	11.0	13.3	9.7	8.6

READING			MATH		
Cares	Non-Cares	Control	Cares	Non-Cares	Control
10.7	13.5	7.5	0.6	13.5	7.0
4.9	11.6	5.3	7.7	8.3	7.4
13.6	6.5	10.7	13.6	4.9	6.0
13.6	8.5	4.3	13.6	8.4	9.2
10.7	9.1	3.3	9.5	8.0	6.7
8.0	9.9	9.1	6.7	7.3	0.6
2.4	11.2	7.8	7.2	8.0	8.3
5.1	13.6	11.4	4.7	11.1	8.4
9.8	5.9	8.5	11.1	3.7	9.5
13.2	10.4	7.4	13.6	13.6	12.9
13.6	6.2	8.3	11.1	5.4	9.7
5.3	4.6	10.5	5.8	4.4	9.6
12.5	13.6	4.3	13.6	10.6	7.7
12.7	8.2	9.8	11.1	9.3	5.4
7.6	13.6	4.3	7.1	10.5	8.3
5.3	12.7	4.6	6.8	11.4	6.7
10.4	2.5	8.5	10.3	3.5	5.7
8.6	7.8	13.6	8.5	11.6	7.9
0.6	12.2	8.0	12.9	13.6	13.6
9.1	3.3	9.5	8.3	4.9	7.9
8.6	3.5	9.8	7.2	5.1	9.2
5.3	13.6	11.9	10.5	10.3	9.5
5.1	6.2	11.6	5.7	4.4	13.6

READING			MATH		
Cares	Non-Cares	Control	Cares	Non-Cares	Control
7.4	5.1	8.5	8.3	6.8	13.8
4.6	0.6	7.6	3.2	7.3	7.4
11.9	9.9	13.6	10.3	8.5	10.0
3.8	5.5	11.9	4.9	4.9	9.3
10.4	7.8	8.6	13.6	5.8	9.1
11.6	4.3	9.2	13.5	4.4	10.0
13.2	0.6	9.8	13.5	0.6	9.5
6.8	9.2	4.1	4.7	7.6	13.6
9.1	5.1	11.2	8.5	8.4	8.7
9.5	4.6	13.2	8.2	7.1	7.9
7.6	5.5	9.8	7.7	12.0	9.1
5.3	5.3	4.1	6.1	6.1	13.6
11.4	11.4	11.2	7.8	9.3	8.7
13.3	0.6	13.2	11.6	6.1	7.9
11.2	9.9	0.6	12.9	0.6	9.1
9.2	10.1	13.6	3.3	10.0	7.2
6.8	9.1	11.9	6.0	9.0	10.2
0.6	6.5	12.5	8.9	8.7	10.2
9.7	5.9	12.2	9.3	4.4	12.7
5.1	8.2	5.9	5.7	7.1	9.4
7.6	5.9	7.2	7.9	3.7	7.9
6.5	8.2	7.2	9.0	8.3	9.5
10.5	4.9	9.1	12.4	4.4	9.3

READING			MATH		
Cares	Non-Cares	Control	Cares	Non-Cares	Control
11.0	10.5	8.0	13.6	8.0	8.0
13.3	8.5	9.2	11.6	13.6	8.5
11.4	9.7	6.5	13.6	7.0	6.3
3.5	4.1	8.2	5.4	6.6	5.7
10.7	5.5	5.8	13.3	5.8	8.3
12.2	9.5	13.6	12.7	6.8	5.5
5.1	7.2	10.4	3.5	8.2	0.6
7.8	4.6	11.4	5.8	6.7	10.2
11.6	5.9	11.2	0.6	6.3	13.6
4.9	6.2	8.6	4.7	3.7	13.6
7.4	5.5	11.2	8.0	7.3	6.1
13.6	7.8	6.8	13.6	10.0	11.4
7.4	7.2	4.2	7.4	4.7	5.7